

for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. FLANNAGAN: Committee on Agriculture. House Joint Resolution 234. Joint resolution to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1933, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 2666. A bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for Indian use, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'CONNOR: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 3345. A bill to authorize the leasing of Indian lands for business, and other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 4235. A bill to amend chapter 16 of the Judicial Code, as amended; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 4236. A bill to amend section 20 (11) of the Interstate Commerce Act, relating to the period of limitation, during the war and emergency period, for the institution of suits against carriers by railroad; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOULSON:

H. R. 4237. A bill to provide that Naval Reserve officers who are graduates of Naval Reserve Officers' Training Schools shall be eligible for permanent commissions; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 4238. A bill providing for the naturalization of certain alien veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. SULLIVAN:

H. R. 4239. A bill to provide for determination of claims for benefits under the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration with respect to persons discharged from the armed forces because of disability, prior to the granting of such discharge, and for other purposes; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. BENNETT of Michigan:

H. R. 4240. A bill to extend the insurance benefits granted by section 602 (D) (2) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 to parents of certain deceased members of the armed forces even though such parents are not dependent; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 4241. A bill to vest title to the U. S. S. *Wolverine* (ex-Michigan) in the foundation for the original U. S. S. Michigan, Inc.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JUDD:

H. J. Res. 241. Joint resolution requesting the President to urge upon the governments of those countries where the cultivation of the poppy plant exists, the necessity of immediately limiting the production of opium to the amount required for strictly medicinal and scientific purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. COLE of Missouri:

H. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution to designate Horace C. Carlisle as poet laureate of Congress, with the privilege of having his poems printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD; to the Committee on the Library.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Ambassador to Chile, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to send a Member of the House of Representatives to a legislative session of the Chilean Chamber of Deputies to be held in Santiago, April 14, 1944; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to instruct the delegate to the peace conference to see that all possible war equipment is returned to this country to be used for the benefit of the farmers and citizens; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to use its prestige to cause the doors of Palestine to be opened for Jewish immigration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

4987. By Mr. ANDREWS: Resolution adopted by the Men's Club of Temple Emanuel, of Buffalo, N. Y., representing 300 members, urging the President and the Congress to take all appropriate and necessary action to insure immediately the withdrawal and nullification of the Palestine White Paper of 1939; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4988. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the employees of the Star Binding and Trimming Corporation, New York City, urging the passage of House Resolution 418, for the establishment in Palestine of a national home for the Jewish people; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4989. Also, petition signed by sundry residents of the State of New York, particularly Westchester County, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4990. Also, petition signed by sundry residents of the State of New York, particularly Bronx County, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4991. By Mr. FULMER: Concurrent resolution submitted by Inez Watson, clerk, house of representatives, Columbia, S. C., requesting the Congress of the United States to provide that United States income-tax returns be simplified; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4992. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Resolution of the Fairfield Rotary Club, Fairfield, Ill., signed by Eldon P. Fleming, president, and L. H. Garrison, secretary, earnestly urging the adoption of House Resolution 418; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4993. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Bonnie Kirby, of Corsicana, Tex., favoring House bill 3761; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4994. Also, petition of Hattie Goodloe, of Red Oak, Tex., favoring House bill 3843; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4995. Also, petition of A. Louise Dietrich, R. N., general secretary and chairman, Texas committee on legislation, Texas Graduate Nurses' Association, favoring House bill 3761; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

4996. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Congregation Beth Shalom, San Francisco, Calif., relative to the abrogation of the Chamberlain White Paper, and urging the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4997. Also, resolution of Congregation Sherith Israel, San Francisco, Calif., relative

to the abrogation of the Chamberlain White Paper, and urging the establishment of a Jewish homeland in Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4998. By Mr. ROHRBOUGH: Petition of H. Hardesty and 719 other citizens of the Third and First Congressional Districts of West Virginia, protesting against the passage of any such prohibition legislation as is contemplated by the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4999. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary of the Lions Club of Mayaguez, Mayaguez, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to discrimination of Puerto Ricans; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

5000. Also, petition of the city clerk, Elizabeth, N. J., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Jewish immigration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5001. Also, petition of the president, Union Republic Youth, San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Gov. Rexford G. Tugwell; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

5002. Also, petition of Asuncion Maldonado, San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Governor Tugwell; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

5003. Also, petition of Luis Garcia, of San Juan, P. R., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to independence of Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our fathers' God, we thank Thee for the stirring ministry of the past, for the story of noble deeds and selfless service, the memory of valiant men who have left their image and superscription forever upon our national life and whose wisdom and sacrifice have been vital factors in making and preserving us a nation. Especially this day we thank Thee for the shining virtues, the moral wisdom, and the elevated patriotism of Thy servant, the first President of the Republic, who still stands among us in lofty reserve.

With clamorous voices demanding our ears we would listen again to his calm and reassuring voice as, being dead, he yet speaketh with unerring judgment, exhorting us to union and harmony. May these warning sentiments bequeathed for the meditation of all future generations come to us with undimmed freshness as a message for these times. Like him whom we this day praise and honor, may we be unswayed by passion or prejudice. May our patriotism be like his, who, being tested by the peddles of ambition, turned from the temptation with indignation and abhorrence. By patience and faith may we, like him, rise above the difficulties, discouragements, and dangers which confront us, as in this day of desperate battle his

unsheathed sword inspires the fighting men of America wherever liberty is challenged by tyranny. So, as the ages roll on, may a grateful nation cherish the luster of his virtues and the greatness of his service. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLARK of Missouri, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, February 21, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Overton
Andrews	Gerry	Radeliffe
Austin	Gillette	Revercomb
Baile	Green	Reynolds
Bankhead	Guffey	Russell
Barkley	Hatch	Shipstead
Bilbo	Hayden	Smith
Bone	Hill	Taft
Bridges	Holman	Thomas, Idaho
Buck	Jackson	Thomas, Utah
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Bushfield	La Follette	Tydings
Butler	McClellan	Vandenberg
Byrd	McFarland	Wallgren
Capper	McKellar	Walsh, N. J.
Caraway	Maybank	Weeks
Chavez	Mead	Wherry
Clark, Idaho	Millikin	White
Clark, Mo.	Moore	Wiley
Connally	Murdock	Willis
Davis	Murray	Wilson
Eastland	Nye	
Ferguson	O'Daniel	

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are absent on public business.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] and Mr. SCRUGHAM are detained on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

#### READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order of January 24, 1901, the Senate every year on this date listens to the reading of Washington's Farewell Address. Under that order the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has been designated to read the address this year.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah advanced to the desk and read the Farewell Address, as follows:

*To the people of the United States:*

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circum-

stances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation,



and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the

equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south*, in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalry alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions,

will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern* and *southern*—*Atlantic* and *western*; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental

maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, exposes to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each

member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism.—But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foment occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should in-

spire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasion of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation desert the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions



of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling occasions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the ani-

mosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand: neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with

ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound, in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience. With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of

intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,  
17th September, 1796.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on February 22, 1937, the senior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], who has just read Washington's Farewell Address, delivered in the Senate an address telling of the Senate's custom in regard to the reading of Washington's Farewell Address each year, and giving some historical background for the address. Since this material is of general public interest, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks following the reading of Washington's Farewell Address.

There being no objection, the address delivered by Mr. THOMAS of Utah was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, the reading of Washington's Farewell Address on his birthday is a Senate custom which the country highly approves. It is a mark of respect due the Father of Our Country. This custom began in the eighties of the last century. Through the nineties, year after year, Senator Hoar, of Massachusetts, submitted a resolution providing that the address be read. On January 24, 1901, he changed his resolution to read as follows:

"Ordered, That, unless otherwise directed on the 22d day of February in each year, \* \* \* Washington's Farewell Address shall be read in the Senate by a Senator to be designated for the purpose by the presiding officer." (Senate Journal, 103, 56-2, January 24, 1901.)

Since the standing order was adopted the Farewell Address has been read alternately by a Democrat and Republican each year.

Laudable as the reading of the address is, it may become a perfunctory practice or it may result in an adherence to one-sided or at least sloganized deductions if we do not from time to time rehearse the real meaning of the address and the reasons for which it was written.

Washington's Farewell Address was not merely advice for future generations prepared by our great first President without consultation, nor was it without partisan political significance. Great as the address is, and

important as it has become, it was a defense of his administration quite as much as an exposition of wisdom and virtue. Washington's wisdom and virtue may be accepted as universal, but his defense must not be separated from his time. The address did not receive unanimous approval. The opponents to his administration saw in it only partisan motives. This is historical fact, not a reflection upon Washington.

A great compliment that can be paid to General Washington was that he took advice. Woodrow Wilson writes:

"General Washington \* \* \* set an example which few of his successors seem to have followed. \* \* \* He made constant and intimate use of his colleagues in every matter that he handled, seeking their assistance and advice by letter when they were at a distance. \* \* \* It is well known \* \* \* that his greater state papers \* \* \* are full of the ideas and the very phrases of the men about him whom he most trusted. His rough drafts came back to him from Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Madison in great part rephrased and rewritten, in many passages reconceived and given a new color." (The President of the United States, by Woodrow Wilson, pp. 67 and 68.)

Professor Beard pictures the background and the address thus:

"This state of affairs confirmed Washington in his determination to retire. \* \* \* He was weary from his burdensome labors in field and forum. \* \* \* Once he had received respectful homage on all occasions; now, near the close of his second administration, he was shocked and grieved to find himself spattered with the mud of political criticism. Having definitely aligned himself with the Federalist group, \* \* \* he had voluntarily incurred the risks of partisan attacks. Nevertheless, he was distressed beyond measure to hear himself assailed, as he complained, 'in such exaggerated and indecent terms as could scarcely be applied to a Nero, a notorious defaulter, or even to a common pickpocket.'"

"\* \* \* In September 1796, on the eve of the Presidential election, he announced his decision in a Farewell Address that is now among the treasured state papers of the American Nation.

"In this note of affection and warning to his fellow citizens, Washington directed their attention especially to three subjects of vital interest. Having dimly sensed the conflict impending between the North and the South, he gravely cautioned them against sectional jealousies. Having suffered from the excesses of factional strife, he warned them against the extremes of partisanship. \* \* \* Having observed the turbulent influence of foreign affairs upon domestic politics, he put them on their guard against 'permanent alliances, \* \* \* artificial entanglements, \* \* \* (and) the insidious wiles of alien intrigues.'"

"Then in simple words of reconciliation he expressed the hope that his country would forgive the mistakes which he had committed during his 45 years of public life, and that he might enjoy, in the midst of his countrymen, 'the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors, and dangers.'" (The Rise of American Civilization, by Charles A. Beard and Mary R. Beard, pp. 371, 372.)

Professor Nevins writes:

"Earnestly desiring leisure, feeling a decline of his physical powers, and wincing under opposition abuse, Washington refused to yield to the general pressure for a third term. This refusal was blended with a testament of sagacious advice to his country in the Farewell Address of September 19, 1796, written largely by Hamilton, but remolded by Washington and expressing his ideas." (Biography of George Washington (retirement), by Allan Nevins.)



Professor Philbrick, in writing of Alexander Hamilton, has this to say:

"His activity in the Cabinet was by no means confined to the finances. . . . It is often said that Hamilton's counsels were predominant with Washington. In domestic affairs this is, on the whole, true. . . . With regard to foreign relations, common sense and better judgment usually supported Jefferson's counsels—but where those qualities were involved Washington needed no counsel. Neutrality and isolation were American policies (to be found in the letters of every public man) before any occasion arose for their official promulgation. There was here no real difference between Hamilton and Jefferson—one sympathized with England, the other with France, but both desired neutrality. . . . In January 1795 Hamilton resigned and returned to the practice of law in New York. . . . But though in private life he remained the continual and chief adviser of Washington, . . . Washington's Farewell Address cannot fairly be said to have been written by Hamilton; for Washington had worked upon it for years, and Madison had contributed to it. But though Washington supplied what he called the body to Hamilton, the latter apparently largely redressed it; and in particular he added what he described as such reflections and sentiments as will wear well, . . . and redound to future reputation." (Biography of Alexander Hamilton, appearing in the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, author, Francis S. Philbrick.)

From the above and other sources we know that early in 1796 Washington began his valedictory. This constituted the first draft, which was sent to Hamilton. Hamilton made a digest known as *Abstract of Points to Form an Address*. From this digest Hamilton began what he called a major draft, and as a result of correspondence the major draft passed back and forth between Washington and Hamilton, and by revision and extension was considerably amended. After Hamilton had completed this major draft and had sent it to Washington, he made another draft known as the draft for incorporating, meaning that Washington might choose either the major draft as material for consideration, or incorporate the other draft with Washington's first one. Washington then began the preparation in his own hand of a manuscript for the printer, known as his own final manuscript, from the material furnished him by Hamilton.

After Washington died, and down through the years, sentences and paragraphs from Washington's address have been pounced upon and quoted as scripture to serve a purpose at a given time or a given place. In a year like the present, when neutrality is on the minds of all, Washington's defense of his own neutrality acts may be used to justify or to condemn a neutrality stand of the present. This is hardly fair. It is the world of today that we must legislate for; not the world as it was in Washington's day. If the address is used for argument today, it is the spirit of the whole that should guide us and not a single phrase or paragraph. The reading of all the related paragraphs to the defense of his neutrality policy proves that he did not conceive conditions to remain as they were, nor did he assume future policy necessarily to be identical with his. His reference to neutrality comes in justification of his proclamation of the 22d of April 1793 and the subsequent legislation. His stand on neutrality referred definitely and particularly to what had been done. Note his words:

"After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound, in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to

maintain it with moderation, perseverance, and firmness.

"Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence (I conjure you to believe me, fellow citizens), the jealousy of a free people ought to be constantly awake; since history and experience prove that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. . . . Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other."

Thus from experiences which were his own came the following general principles:

"The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith. Here let us stop."

"Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. . . ."

"Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient Government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel."

Running through the whole of the address we discover the elements of growth, as expressed above in the words "the period is not far off." We note also his desire for constitutional change only by peaceful process, and the theory that the time may come when our strength may be sufficient to withstand all threats to our peace. Thus one reason for our neutrality then was a necessary one due to our weakness.

Washington, with the wisdom of a prophet, foresaw that an adherence to the policies of fair dealing and honesty would bring its reward to the Nation just as it does to the individual. Nowhere in Washington's writings do we find the assumption that conditions are static. It would be impossible for him to have accepted that philosophy when we understand the theories of his time in regard to the concept of progress. The fathers of our country were influenced in their philosophical outlook by the theory of progress which broke upon the European and American world like a new renaissance after certain contacts with an older civilization. Condorcet and the *Encyclopédistes* had caught the spirit of progress. Washington, Jefferson, and our whole early governmental processes reflect it. Without the idea of progress could our Government have adopted the motto for its great seal, "Annuit coeptis. Novus ordo seclorum"?

Chief Justice Jay, in his decision in *Chisholm v. Georgia* (2 Dall. 419), lays down the doctrine that a new order of legal processes was set up under the Constitution which was a break with the past. Jay carried the idea too far, because, of course, there can be no break with the past. The people soon overcame the legal consequences of Jay's decision by adopting the eleventh amendment.

The following quotation from Jefferson also reflects the spirit of progress of the time:

"I shall not die without a hope that light and liberty are on steady advance. We have seen, indeed, once within the records of history a complete eclipse of the human mind continuing for centuries. . . . And even

should the cloud of barbarism and despotism again obscure the science and liberties of Europe, this country remains to preserve and restore light and liberty to them. In short, the flames kindled on the Fourth of July 1776 have spread over too much of the globe to be extinguished by the feeble engines of despotism; on the contrary, they will consume these engines and all who work them." (Jefferson's letter to John Adams, September 12, 1821.)

Washington's idea was one of change resulting in growth and development for he had already written:

"As the member of an infant empire . . . and as a citizen of the great republic of humanity at large, I cannot help turning my attention sometimes to this subject. I would be understood to mean I cannot avoid reflecting with pleasure on the probable influence that commerce may hereafter have on human manners and society in general. On these occasions I consider how mankind may be connected, like one great family, in fraternal ties. I indulge a fond, perhaps an enthusiastic, idea that, as the world is evidently much less barbarous than it has been, its amelioration must still be progressive; that nations are becoming more humanized in their policy; that the subjects of ambition and causes for hostility are daily diminishing; and in fine that the period is not very remote when the benefits of a liberal and friendly commerce will pretty generally succeed to the devastation and horrors of war." (Washington's letter to Lafayette, August 15, 1786.)

Students of the history of ideas know where Washington got the phrase "one great family, in fraternal ties."

As these ideas continue to evolve in his mind, he conceived of a changing and more refined justification of war, for he wrote that the resort to war can be justified only on the score of maintenance of self-respect. Thus, by 1795, he believed—

"It is well known that peace (to borrow a modern phrase) has been the order of the day with me since the disturbance in Europe first commenced. My policy has been, and will continue, while I have the honor to remain in the administration of the Government, to be upon friendly terms with, but independent of, all nations of the earth; to fulfill our own engagements; to supply the wants and be carrier for them all; being thoroughly convinced that it is our policy and interest to do so. Nothing short of self-respect, and that justice which is essential to a national character, ought to involve us in war." (Washington's letter to Gouverneur Morris, December 22, 1795.)

If we do not consider a man's life, his writings, and his aspirations as a whole, but consider them only in minute detail, and if we draw deductions from those details, we may find a mass of contradictions and end in an argument over petty deductions. Thus, in spite of all that Washington advised against alliance (and the alliance principle was the international curse of his time, as it is of ours), Washington said this:

"At present everything in America is tranquil, and I hope will long remain so. It is not our interest to seek new broils, and I hope our neighbors will not commence them. . . . I never expect to draw my sword again; I can scarcely conceive the cause that would induce me to do it. But if, contrary to all expectations, such an event should take place, I should think it a fortunate circumstance, and myself highly honored, to have it supported by yours. . . . My first wish is . . . to see the whole world in peace, and the inhabitants of it as one band of brothers striving who should contribute most to the happiness of mankind." (Washington's letter to the Marquis de la Rouerie, October 7, 1785.)

Here, again, we may refer to the prophetic Washington. He did look into the future, as

anyone who has accepted Condorcet's theory of progress must and if he could have seen this day, he would not see the whole world in peace, but he would see a group made up of many nations "striving to contribute most to the happiness of mankind," and he would see his own country cooperating with most of the nations of the world, or with citizens of most of the world's nations, in international problems "striving to contribute most to the happiness of mankind." Washington's dream of the nations working together has in a sense been fulfilled. His own country participates officially in at least 6 forms of what we may call permanent international cooperation, and in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, the United States took part in more than 50 international conferences and congresses. During the same year America participated in 5 international expositions and celebrations and associated itself with about 15 permanent international commissions, committees, institutes, tribunals, and similar organizations. During the same year the United States participated in more than 15 permanent international bureaus, unions, and similar organizations. The United States now is a party to treaties of conciliation with more than 35 countries. Likewise, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1935, the United States functioned through 5 special arbitration tribunals of limited duration. The above international undertakings are all outside our regular Diplomatic and Consular Services.

Was Washington thinking only of the Thirteen States when he wrote the following? Probably so; I do not know. But the program which he conceived for the future welfare of the Thirteen States is in spirit a program which we might conceive as broad enough for the future welfare of all States. Washington's program was:

"First. . . . Union of the States under one Federal head;

"Second. A sacred regard to public justice;

"Third. The adoption of a proper peace establishment; and

"Fourth. The prevalence of that pacific and friendly disposition among the people of the United States, which will induce them to forget their local prejudices and policies; to make those mutual concessions, which are requisite to the general prosperity; and, in some instances, to sacrifice their individual advantages to the interest of the community." (Washington's Legacy, addressed to the Governors of all the States on the disbanding of the Army from his headquarters at Newburgh, N. Y., on June 8, 1783.)

To the extent that we in America have followed Washington's four principles we have succeeded in becoming what we are. To the extent that the world as a whole will adopt those principles, the people of the world may enjoy peace and orderly intercourse. It is the idea which I would stress. For no one in the world today would advocate a world-wide superstate. But the rest of the program has universal application.

And thus Washington dreamed. But no dream can equal the real march of America. Even Condorcet could not envision progress equal to this simple retelling of actual history:

Under heaven Columbus sailed and a new world was found. Here men of common hope from many climes made homes. These men, nurtured in freedom, brought to the New World tried and lasting ideals of the old, and when the motherland failed to cherish the best of its own, a clash occurred. This Jefferson justified and made purposeful by the Declaration of Independence (1776). Led by Washington, patriots put down the mighty, and those of low degree sought safety in law. Blessed by peace, but not yet one in purpose, the fathers of the new Nation covenanted for a more perfect union. They proposed a government to bring justice to life and liberty

in pursuit of happiness. Thus 13 States became one, and democracy was given birth. Citizens, guided by a President, spoke their will through Congress, and that they might never lose their rights through the force of the past or the will of the dead, and that the letter of the law might not kill but its spirit live, a supreme court was established, and thereby the Constitution of the United States became a living oracle, fitting past purposes to present needs and freeing the minds of men from fear of the future (1789). Loosed from powers that dull and thwart, the people, inspired with justice, caused the newly founded democracy to fill the vacant places. Imbued with zeal to make sleeping nature serve and the desert blossom as the rose, they pressed on that many might earn blessings formerly garnered only by the few. Onward and upward and ever forward they advanced, unashamed to pray, willing to die, happy in planting that men might eat. Urged to use, bent on building, they never once turned back. Moving westward, by purchase, they added vast Louisiana (1803). Next, south, they won by cession the Floridas (1819). Then into Texas they went, which, by annexation, became part of the Union (1845). By agreement with neighbors on the north, Oregon was divided, bringing lasting peace to a long boundary (1846). After strife a sister nation to the south ceded and sold Mexican soil (1848). To this mighty country, rich in plenty and secure in law, many thousands came to enjoy her benefits and admire her greatness. They built a nation of freemen, a nation of thoughtful women, a nation of forward-looking children, where each, equal before the law, is master of himself but servant to all; where the majority rule, but the minority are protected; where kings may pause to see justice done, but where no king shall ever reign. This land, where men are responsible and restrained but free to think, to come, to go, and to do—so great in territory, so noble in tradition—nevertheless fought with itself, and under Lincoln men gave their all that the government of the people, by the people, and for the people should not perish from the earth. Wounds healed, the people again made one, no longer is there North and no longer is there South. With new faith in old purposes, Alaska was purchased, removing despotic rule from America (1867). To surround the land by a single sea, Roosevelt built the Panama Canal, which united a nation by dividing a continent (1904). No longer are the waters of the earth separate. No longer is there East and no longer is there West. For God hath wrought that men may have joy and in this land of promise gain life abundant. Then a strife-maddened earth called democracy to its assistance. Men died that war might be no more. Victory gained, Wilson proposed and nations set up institutions for peace and legal process (1919). The path of peace is not assured, but the way to peace is in the earth.

Thus Washington's dream of "one great family in fraternal ties" and of himself "a citizen of the great republic of humanity at large" is today democracy's promise for the future.

#### JEWISH NATIONAL HOME IN PALESTINE— RESOLUTION OF NEW JERSEY LEGISLATURE

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey, by unanimous consent, presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress to use its prestige to cause the doors of Palestine to be opened for Jewish immigration, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, under the rule, ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### Senate Concurrent Resolution 6

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to use its prestige to cause the doors of Palestine to be opened for Jewish immigration

Whereas European Jewry was the first victim of the enemies of democracy, having been singled out for especial attack and ruthless persecution to an extent which has shocked the conscience of the civilized world; and

Whereas Great Britain issued on November 2, 1917, the Balfour Declaration pledging the establishment of a national home in Palestine for Jewish people; and

Whereas this policy was not only incorporated into the mandate for Palestine, but was also concurred in by the United States in a joint congressional resolution of 1922, and further sanctioned in the British-American Convention of 1924; and

Whereas this declared policy of the British and United States Governments was in effect abrogated by the Chamberlain administration through the issuance of the Palestine white paper of 1939 which will by its terms stop all further Jewish immigration into the Holy Land by March 31, 1944, thereby sealing the doom of the remnant of the Jewish population of occupied Europe; and

Whereas this act of inhumanity constitutes a violation of international covenants solemnly entered into and is contrary to the traditional American sense of justice and fair play: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey (the House of Assembly concurring):

1. The legislature expresses its profound sympathy to the victims of Nazi persecution, which challenges all traditions and teachings of Christianity and Americanism.

2. The Legislature of the State of New Jersey respectfully urges and petitions the President of the United States, Congress, and the Secretary of State to use the weight and prestige of their respective offices to the end that the doors of the ancestral home of the Jewish people shall be opened wide for free entry of all Jews who are in need of a haven of refuge and desire to build their homes there; and that in pursuance of its clear intent and purpose, the pledge of the Balfour Declaration be honored so as to bring about the development of a self-governing Jewish commonwealth in Palestine, which shall become a part of the new democratic world order in accordance with the fight for the "four freedoms" in which we are engaged.

3. The Secretary of the State of New Jersey be and he is hereby directed to forward copies of this concurrent resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of State, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the Senators and Representatives of the State of New Jersey in the Congress of the United States.

4. This concurrent resolution shall take effect immediately.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a resolution identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### WARTIME METHOD OF VOTING BY MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES—PETITIONS

Mr. WALSH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have notation made thereof that I have today received petitions from citizens of New Jersey praying for the enactment of the so-called Green-Lucas soldiers' vote bill. I am informed that the petitions are signed by 7,000 persons in New Jersey, each of whom indicates that he or



she has one or more relatives in the armed forces of the United States.

There being no objection, the petitions were received and ordered to lie on the table.

#### EXTENSION OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION—REPORT OF BANKING AND CURRENCY COMMITTEE

Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1945, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 718) thereon.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

(Mr. GEORGE (for himself and Mr. MURRAY) introduced Senate bill 1730, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. 1731. A bill for the relief of Helen Halverson; and

S. 1732. A bill for the relief of Arthur M. Sellers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 1733. A bill to provide additional allowances for certain dependents of certain disabled veterans; to the Committee on Finance.

#### POST-WAR ECONOMIC REHABILITATION

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, out of order I ask permission to introduce a bill in behalf of myself and the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and to make a very brief statement regarding the bill. I ask also, Mr. President, that the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, because that committee would, in the main I think, have jurisdiction of it.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1730) to create an office of demobilization, establish general policies for the operation of that office, provide for the settlement of claims arising from terminated war contracts, provide for the disposal of surplus Government property, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. GEORGE (for himself and Mr. MURRAY) was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the bill I have just introduced is drawn to effectuate the recommendations of the Senate Committee on Post-War Economic Policy and Planning.

Since it was drawn the report of Mr. Baruch has been released and made public, and an Executive order has been issued in conformity therewith appointing certain persons to perform certain of the duties recommended by Mr. Baruch.

There is nothing sought to be done by Mr. Baruch that cannot be done under the provisions of this bill. The post-war committee report and the bill deal with the questions in broader outline, in many cases, than does the Baruch report, but in the objectives sought to be accomplished there is no possible conflict.

This bill creates an office of demobilization which would be subordinate to the

Office of War Mobilization during the period of hostilities. It states the basic objectives that Congress is seeking to accomplish and lays down broad general policies for their accomplishment. Under it the director of demobilization would appoint deputy directors to handle the problems of surplus property disposal, contract termination, plant disposal, human demobilization, and other problems that were presented in the total picture. The work of these deputies would be coordinated by the director of demobilization and the general policies of the director would be subject to constant scrutiny by a joint congressional committee, which is set up in the bill and which would have authority to sit with the demobilization board. The director would be accountable to the Executive, but also would be accountable to Congress, in these broad policies.

The Baruch report would have all the coordination between these activities through the Director of Mobilization, under his executive authority. He would have a work director, a surplus property administrator, and a contract termination board, all set up by Executive order, and he would come to Congress for such legislation as was necessary to enable them to function. In relation to surplus property Mr. Baruch specifically recommends against congressional enactment at this time.

I believe the Congress will be glad to grant any legislative authority that is necessary, and this bill attempts to accomplish that. It goes further, however, and starts the administration of these difficult but not impossible problems off on a firm legislative foundation and avoids the possibility of a pattern being set that will be unsatisfactory to the Congress and that at a later date they may have to change, with consequent confusion.

In addition to setting up the office of demobilization and providing for surplus disposal, the bill also incorporates the provisions of Senate bill 1718, which was jointly introduced by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and myself on February 11 and which, in its entirety, as I understand, is expressly approved by the Baruch report.

#### A TRIBUTE TO THE FORGOTTEN MAN—ARTICLE BY SENATOR REYNOLDS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "A Tribute to the Forgotten Man," written by him for the National Record which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PROBLEMS OF FOREIGN TRADE—ADDRESS BY HON. ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address on the problems of foreign trade, delivered by Hon. Alf M. Landon, former Governor of Kansas, at Kirksville, Mo., on February 17, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### VICTORY, WHAT THEN?—ADDRESS BY JUDGE NEAL W. WORKMAN

[Mr. SMITH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an address entitled "Victory, What Then?" delivered by Judge Neal W. Workman, at Laurens, S. C., November 11, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PROSPECT OF RUSSIAN-FINNISH PEACE—ARTICLE BY CONSTANTINE BROWN

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article relative to the prospect of a Soviet-dictated peace with Finland, written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Washington Evening Star of February 16, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### OPPOSITION TO MR. CHURCHILL—ARTICLE BY FRANK C. WALDROP

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Churchill Is Slipping," written by Frank C. Waldrop, and published in the Washington Times-Herald of February 21, 1944, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### SELFISHNESS, AMERICA'S PUBLIC ENEMY NO. 1—ARTICLE BY CHAPLAIN GROVER C. SCHWARTZ

[Mr. EASTLAND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "Selfishness, America's Public Enemy No. 1," by Chaplain Grover C. Schwartz, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### OUR FIRST COMMANDER IN CHIEF—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Our First Commander in Chief," from the Washington Times-Herald, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE REVENUE BILL—VETO

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, there is informally and unofficially, of course, before us the veto message of the President of the United States on the tax bill. The message, of course, goes to the House of Representatives, and will be a matter for the consideration of the Members of that body. Perhaps any comment on the message in the Senate at this time would be inappropriate, but I cannot refrain from pointing out, by way of factual analysis only, the wholly unsatisfactory and inconclusive grounds upon which the President has been misled into vetoing the bill.

I do not refer now to the recommendation recently made by the President for additional revenue of ten and one-half billion dollars, and I do not minimize the importance of increasing the revenue as much as possible. When the bill came to the Senate from the House it would have raised a little less revenue than the bill would have raised as it was finally passed by both Houses. In the Senate, both in the committee and on the floor, we increased the revenue which would be produced by the tax bill, and in conference the bill agreed upon and reported to both Houses and passed by both Houses provided for a slight increase in revenue over that which would have resulted from the House bill as it originally passed that body. I am not discussing that at this time, beyond one statement which I should make.

There was in the House strong disagreement with the method recommended by the Treasury and Judge VINSON. That strong opposition was not overcome, and the House sent to the Senate a bill under which, as I have said, even slightly less revenue would have been raised than under the final conference-report bill.

In the Senate committee we directly asked of the Secretary of the Treasury if he had changed his views or withdrawn his positive opposition to a sales tax in any form, or to compulsory savings or compulsory loans. We were told, categorically, "No." So the majority of the Senate committee believed then, and I am sure believe now, and, in my opinion, all America believes now, that if we are to raise revenue in addition to the heavy burden of taxes resting upon the American taxpayers we must be free to consider new methods of taxation and new procedures in obtaining taxes. That is all I have to say on that point.

Mr. President, I wish to notice factually certain specific reasons enumerated by the President to support his disapproval of the bill. I shall, therefore, have to read from his message. Among the special privileges pointed out by the President as reason for his veto are:

(a) Permission for corporations reorganized in bankruptcy to retain the high excess-profits credit and depreciation basis attributable to the contributions of stockholders who are usually eliminated in the reorganization. This privilege inures to the benefit of bondholders who, in many cases, have purchased their bonds in the speculative market for far less than their face value. It may open the door to further windfall profits in this market because of the undeserved benefit received by reorganized corporations.

I wish most respectfully to point out that corporations which emerge from bankruptcy or from receivership proceedings are not always taken over by bondholders. Indeed, infrequently is that true, in point of fact. Only in the case of railroads is that statement actually applicable, and railroads already have precisely the treatment which the Senate and House gave to other corporations whose physical identity was actually preserved, or in a large sense preserved.

So long as they remain in bankruptcy or receivership, of course, they have the same basis of taxes and they have the same valuations. We merely provided that when corporations other than railroads emerged from receivership they would retain the basis of values for taxation purposes enjoyed by the old corporations. In explaining on the floor of the Senate the amendment which made this provision I used language which I had desired to call to the attention of the Senate, but I do not have it before me at the moment. Substantially it was what I have already stated this morning.

The second objection in the veto message to a specific provision is as follows:

(b) Percentage depletion allowances, questionable in any case, are now extended to such minerals as vermiculite, potash, feldspar, mica, talc, lepidolite, barite, and spodumene. In the case of some of these minerals the War Production Board refused to certify that current output was inadequate for war needs.

Percentage depletion was extended in the House to flake graphite, vermiculite, potash, beryl, feldspar, mica, lepidolite, and spodumene. The Senate added talc and barite, and reduced the rate on potash from 23 percent to 15 percent. All these allowances are limited to the

duration of the war, with the exception of the allowance as to potash, which is made permanent.

The Treasury concurred only in the action taken in granting percentage depletion to fluor spar, flake graphite, sheet mica, and beryl. Under the bill as passed by the House there was added to the list of minerals exempt from excess-profits taxes, because of strategic importance, fluor spar, flake graphite, and vermiculite. The Treasury objects to the inclusion of vermiculite among these strategic minerals. All these changes were added by the House.

Mr. President, there has long been a controversy over making percentage depletion allowances, but it has become a fixed policy of this Government, speaking through its several Congresses, to allow percentage depletion in the case of certain minerals.

In the list are some strategic minerals which have been added during the war, the producers of which have been given percentage depletion allowances, not against their normal tax liability, nor against their surtax liability, but only against excess-profits taxes. In the case of all these new metals and minerals, except potash, the benefit is simply given during the actual continuance of the war.

Mr. President, in Canada it has been found necessary to give far larger benefits to strategic minerals and metals than we have considered giving in the United States. The Canadian Government has reversed its policy during the war, and out of necessity.

In the case of potash the depletion allowance is continued. If there is any vital mineral on which depletion allowance can be justified, it is potash.

Mr. HATCH. Will the Senator from Georgia yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to make a brief statement, then I shall yield.

During World War No. 1, when we had not developed sources of potash in this country, the price of potash went to the extreme height of nearly \$400 a ton. American agriculture was helpless in that situation. Since World War No. 1 we have found, I believe, some two or three deposits of potash in this country, and in the bill passed, Congress was merely giving to the potash producer relief against the war excess-profits tax. Yet our good President has been misled into the recitation of that very just provision as a ground for his veto message.

I now yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. HATCH. I wish to interrupt the Senator merely to say that with respect to potash it would seem that the President says the depletion allowance is something new and has just been made. In a sense that is correct. But there have heretofore been permanent allowances, called discovery allowances, which had been awarded to the potash industry. The present tax bill changes the form and provides for a depletion allowance instead of a discovery allowance. I am sure this must not have been called to the attention of the President, but if the bill comes before the Senate for discus-

sion I shall be glad to explain the situation.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator. I had not intended to indulge in any long discussion.

The third ground of the veto is stated as follows:

(c) The lumber industry is permitted to treat income from the cutting of timber, including selective logging, as a capital gain rather than annual income. As a grower and seller of timber, I think that timber should be treated as a crop and therefore as income when it is sold. This would encourage reforestation.

Mr. President, if there was ever a nicely adjusted provision in a tax bill that meant conservation of a fast-disappearing natural resource vital to the prosperity of the Nation, to wit, our timber, it was in this half-way step which Congress took to provide some protection to the timber owner.

What is the situation under existing law? If one owns timber and sells it outright to a milling company he is entitled to treat his gain as a capital gain. Indeed, that is all the gain he has. He has not manufactured anything. He has not done anything. He has simply sold a part of his realty. The President has been misled into saying that the timber is a crop. He evidently has in mind an annual crop. By all the concepts of all the laws of every civilized nation growing timber is a part of the realty, and it is so in fact.

If under existing law—not under the bill as vetoed—the owner of timber which he has grown on his land, and conserved and protected against fire for 40 years, sells his timber, he has a capital gain, and only a capital gain. But if he takes his own mill onto his own land and cuts his own timber, he must account for all the profits he makes, and he is soon pushed up into the high bracket excess profits tax, and his timber is simply taken away from him.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think the public probably does not understand the difference between the tax charged against the owner of the timber to which the Senator refers if he pays on the basis of a capital gain, or if he pays on the basis of annual income. The Senator from Georgia has already pointed out that if he or I own a tract of timber—which I do not, I will say—we may have owned that timber and it may have been growing for 40 years. We may have been compelled to pay some money by way of expense in the development and the preservation of that timber. We may have been required to insure it because of forest fires. We finally sell the timber in a block or in a body to a milling company, a sawmill, or a lumber producer. Whatever price we get for it, we account for it as a capital gain, and pay taxes on it accordingly.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. But if I decide that I want to mill that lumber myself, and I buy a sawmill and move it in onto the timber, cut it myself, and saw it up into



lumber and sell it myself, I am compelled under the present law to be taxed as if that were income for that year, and I am allowed nothing in deduction for all the expense I have been put to in producing and preserving the timber during the years of its growth. Is that true?

Mr. GEORGE. That is substantially correct. The timber amendment, in my opinion, is a very just amendment. It does not open a loophole in our tax laws for other natural resources which are not at all comparable. Those of us who come from the deep Southeast are well aware of the fact that in many instances the land without the timber is of little or no value. The real value is in the timber. It requires time to produce it. It requires the payment of taxes, the maintenance of fire protection, and many other costs. If the owner of the timber cannot go on his own land and cut it without accumulating an income which will rapidly push him up into an excess-profits bracket, he is virtually forbidden or prohibited from utilization of his own timber.

Mr. BARKLEY. If I may, I should like to ask the Senator another question. The bill which the President has just vetoed provides that the owner of the timber who himself cuts it and markets it is allowed the same tax privilege that someone else would be allowed if he bought the timber and himself sawed it and marketed it?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; that is essentially true, because any purchaser of the timber who immediately cuts it, of course, recovers the full amount he paid for the timber before he begins to have a net taxable income.

Mr. BARKLEY. And a company which is in the lumber business, buying timber year by year, and sawing it year by year, of course, accounts for any profit as an annual income. It seems to me that is an entirely different proposition from that of a man who has over a period of a half a century developed a forest or a tract of timber, and then either decides to sell it as an entirety, or to cut it and market it himself. If he sells it he gets a capital gain, but if he cuts it and markets it piece by piece or by the thousand feet, under the present law he is taxed on income and not as a capital gain.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator correctly states the case.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator from Georgia comment on the statement "This would encourage reforestation"? Is it not true that the more profitable the lumber industry is the more reforestation would be encouraged? Is not the amendment designed to encourage reforestation?

Mr. GEORGE. Unquestionably it is so designed. It was recommended to us by a vast majority of the reforestation offices in the several States. They recommended the amendment on the ground that it represented a conserva-

tion program. This is what it would permit: If one owns a thousand acres of timbered land, with hardwood and softwood, and timber of all sizes and ages scattered throughout the thousand acres, he may take his mill onto the land, and he may by selective cutting continue his timber operations or lumbering operations with respect to that land through a long period of time; indeed, he can do it perpetually. It is the only basis on which the timber owner can really become a true conservator of timber. He is not only induced to reforest, to replant as he cuts the timber, but he is enabled to do it because he is not required to take it all off at once. All the amendment would do would be to give to the owner the right to treat his income from his timber—not from his operations, not from his profits on his lumber sold—but from his timber, as a capital gain.

The President, in striking down the potash amendment and in specifically condemning the timber amendment, unwittingly has struck agriculture and forestry very definite and staggering blows.

The next ground enumerated in the message is as follows:

(d) Natural gas pipe lines are exempted from the excess-profits tax without justification and in a manner which might well lead oil companies to request similar treatment for their pipe lines.

Mr. President, I may say in all frankness that the Senate committee disagreed with that provision in the bill as passed by the House. We struck out the percentage depletion allowance for pipe lines; but the House conferees insisted, and we finally agreed, as one must finally agree in connection with any complicated bill such as a general tax bill. However, there were very strong arguments made to the effect that in the case of the pipe lines serving gas wells the pipe lines are a part, themselves, of the property, and must necessarily be given some special tax treatment, or else the excess-profits taxes would destroy the income from the gas.

The next ground enumerated in the veto message is as follows:

(e) Commercial air lines are granted an unjustifiable extension of the tax subsidy on their air-mail contracts.

When the conferees were sitting on the 1942 tax bill, I believe it was—at least, the tax bill prior to the present one—the question involved in this amendment was presented to the conference. The Treasury expressed approval of the principle; whereupon I said that the Senate conferees would abandon any effort to insert an amendment which we thought was open in conference on this particular point. In all good faith, Mr. Surrey undertook to perfect an amendment, to be offered during the committee consideration of the tax bill on this particular subject. Mr. Surrey was directed to confer with, or he elected to confer with, the Civil Aeronautics Administration, whereupon they raised some objection to the whole method of taxing commercial air lines, and objected. Mr. Surrey very properly stated the case to me. Nevertheless, we offered the amendment, and I offered it with a full

explanation of precisely what it was; and it went into the conference, and was accepted.

Under the Second Revenue Act of 1940, an airplane company was not required to pay an excess-profits tax if its excess-profits-tax net income, after excluding its air-mail subsidy, did not exceed its excess-profits-tax credit. That is in existing law. If its excess-profits-tax net income exceeded its excess-profits credit, with the air-mail subsidy excluded, it was required to pay a tax on its air-mail subsidy income as well as on its other income. The advantage of this relief was nullified to a large extent where the corporation had an unused excess-profits carry-over. This exempt air-mail income reduced the amount of the unused excess-profits credit available as an offset in reducing the excess-profits-tax net income in other taxable years. This section provides that where the air-mail subsidy exclusion prevents the taxpayer from paying an excess-profits tax for the year excluded, it shall not reduce the unused excess-profits credit to be carried over and applied to other taxable years.

That is the full effect of the amendment. It is entirely in harmony with the theory of existing law. It is just. But beyond all that it applies to only two or possibly three commercial air lines in the United States. That would not seem to be a substantial basis upon which to veto a general tax bill.

In speaking about the so-called Johnson amendment—I think we may refer to it as such—about which I have already spoken, let me add that this amendment permitting corporations emerging from bankruptcy or receivership to use the basis of the predecessor for tax purposes was agreed to with certain modifications. In order to avoid refunds, however, the amendment was made applicable only to 1943, a year on which taxes have not as yet been paid, and to subsequent years. It was also provided that no gain or loss would be recognized to the shareholders upon the receipt in 1943 and subsequent years of new securities for the old securities. A somewhat similar provision, which all Senators will remember, had already been given to common carriers by rail, and I think, on the whole, the provisions have been generally approved, although the railway companies themselves have constantly insisted that what they really wanted was a different treatment—that is, that the treatment accorded them did not go far enough.

Mr. President, I shall not consume more of the time of the Senate. These are the specific reasons set out beyond the first general observation made by the President that he had asked for \$10,500,000,000, whereas the bill really would provide an amount in excess of \$2,000,000,000 in new revenue.

I express profound regret that the President has seen fit to point out in his message that the social-security tax, under the freeze provision carried in the bill which was presented to him, has reduced the income of the tax bill by \$1,100,000,000.

Of course, Mr. President, the social security tax is a special fund. It is collected for a special purpose. It becomes a loan fund available to the Treasury—indeed, a compulsory loan fund—when it passes into the Treasury; but it is no different from any other loan made by the Treasury. Under existing law the Treasury has authority to take Federal bonds to the counters of the Federal Reserve bank, pass them over, and compel the bank to take them. Under the law the Treasury is required to put its bonds into the special social security fund and take the tax out, minus, of course, such proportion of the tax as may be necessary to meet the current cost of administration. In no conceivable sense is the social security fund a revenue item, whether it is frozen or unfrozen. It affects only the fiscal policies of Government on its bond selling side.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think it is fair to the Senator and to the Senate, as well as to any one else who may be interested, to state that in the Committee on Finance the Senator from Georgia and I both voted against freezing the social security tax.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. The committee adopted the amendment by a very large majority. When the bill came to the Senate the Senator from Georgia, as chairman of the committee, felt bound by the action of the committee. I myself felt perfectly free to oppose on the floor of the Senate the freezing of the social security tax, and I did so. In the remarks which I made I stated that under no circumstances would I vote for the stepping up of this tax for revenue purposes. I would not vote for the tax to be stepped up unless it were needed in the fund, merely because the Treasury found a fund from which it might borrow. I believe that taxes ought to be levied for the support of the Government, as taxes, although the law authorizes the Treasury—and compels it, as a matter of fact—to borrow from this fund.

The Senate disagreed with my position, and the amendment was written into the bill. It seems to me, in all frankness, that it is not quite accurate bookkeeping in the Treasury to subtract the increased amount of \$1,100,000,000 a year from the \$2,100,000,000 which the tax bill would raise, and say that by reason thereof the net tax produced by the bill would be \$1,000,000,000 or less. That sort of bookkeeping is out of harmony with my views as to fiscal policy in the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator. The Senator has correctly stated what happened in the Finance Committee and on the floor of the Senate. The Senator very ably argued against the amendment, but he did so solely on the ground that he was interested in the ultimate preservation of the social security fund itself. The Senator has precisely stated the position which he then took. As I have stated, I regret that the President

has dealt with the social security fund in the manner indicated in his message.

Mr. President, I have no desire to be critical. That is not my purpose in making this brief statement. If the President really thought it proper to increase the burden of taxes on the American people at this time, he could well have approved the bill and asked in a message for immediate consideration of other revenue-producing measures. If he thought that the provisions which I have explained to the Senate were objectionable for any reason, it would have been easy enough to have approved the tax bill and asked the committees of Congress to give immediate consideration to their modification or repeal. The Ways and Means Committee of the House has already begun work on the technical and administrative provisions of the tax laws, and every reference the President has made would come within the direct purview and scope of the undertaking of the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

The committees have worked on this bill for quite a long time. Two and a third billion dollars of additional revenue sounds insignificant at this time; but when that amount is added to the present tax burden of \$40,000,000,000 it becomes quite a different thing. Men may have honest differences of judgment. My own judgment, as I have heretofore stated it, is that unless we can consider all methods and all means of raising revenue, with assurance of administration support, it is not feasible—and I do not believe it is right or just—to increase the individual income rates, because the increase must of necessity fall on incomes from \$60,000, or \$70,000 all the way down to the lowest bracket. The greater part of the increase must of necessity fall on the so-called white-collar class, or middle brackets. While I do not like a sales tax, I would have the courage to go down the line for a sales tax if the administration wanted it. I would consider the application of the excess-profits-tax principle to individual incomes, but that has been consistently opposed by the Treasury. I would be willing to go down the line for a compulsory loan or compulsory savings program, but that has been constantly opposed by the Treasury Department.

Mr. President, that is the situation. In addition to the present tax burden of \$40,000,000,000, this bill would have brought into the Treasury two and one-third billion dollars more. Furthermore, Mr. President, because of the marked improvement which we made in the Contract Renegotiation Act, at least \$2,000,000,000 would have been covered into the Treasury. In my opinion, the Contract Renegotiation Act, as proposed to be amended by the conference report, would meet the reasonable test of any court; but, without the amendment, no one can say with confidence that it may not become necessary for the courts finally to root it out, lock, stock, and barrel. If so, the refunds which the Treasury will make will be not inconsiderable. Two tax bills such as we presented, and more, would be required to provide for such refunds.

We sought honestly to devise a perfectly valid renegotiation-of-contracts act. We approached the problem directly so that the contractors and the Government agencies would all know what they were doing, and what it all meant, and so that it would greatly facilitate the whole process of renegotiation. To the credit of every one of the services, so far as I know, no one has complained either to the committees or to the executive branch of government about the renegotiation-of-contracts act.

Mr. Patterson, the Under Secretary of War, has said that under the present act the renegotiations of contracts in the year 1942 had resulted in the recovery of approximately \$5,000,000,000—I do not use his exact figures—of which at least one and one-half billion dollars would not have come into the Treasury through taxation. However, unquestionably under the law which we presented to the President in the present tax bill, renegotiations covering the fiscal or calendar year 1943, the great peak year of production, would have amounted to more money, and the actual net gain to the Treasury would have been fully \$2,000,000,000. The President has lost that sum to the Treasury by the veto if the House shall approve the Presidential veto.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I feel some responsibility in this situation as the ranking Republican member of the Senate Finance Committee, which has conscientiously labored upon this measure for many difficult months.

The President's veto may never reach the Senate. I hope that it will. But if it be not overridden in the other House the Senate will never have an opportunity to express its opinion in respect to the President's thesis. Therefore, immediately on the heels of the arrival of the President's message in the other House, I wish now briefly to make the RECORD clear and to state my own reaction.

Mr. President, I wish to say first of all that the case is summed up for me in an accurate editorial in yesterday's New York Times, which certainly has not been an unsympathetic newspaper so far as the present administration is concerned. On yesterday morning an editorial in the New York Times stated in part as follows:

A veto of the present tax bill would be an irresponsible act.

I repeat: It "would be an irresponsible act."

I now read the concluding sentence from the editorial:

If the President vetoes this measure there can be but one answer. Congress should override the veto.

Mr. President, I do not believe this veto of the tax bill has been justified at any point in the President's often mistaken and frequently distorted discussion of the problems involved, as already clearly disclosed by the able Senator from Georgia in his recent analysis. If the newspapers correctly report the recommendations of his own congressional party leaders to him, all of whom voted for the bill, he would have been better advised to have signed the tax measure despite any of its incidental infirmities.



There will never be a tax bill without some infirmities, particularly under the auspices of this whole House and this Treasury.

Mr. President, if the new revenue provided by the bill is inadequate from the Presidential standpoint, then it is a curious and irrational cure which would stubbornly reject any new revenue whatever from the same source.

New revenue to the tune of approximately two and one-half billion dollars is still not to be despised even in the martial climax of a prodigal era of illimitable deficit spending. To demand \$10,000,000,000 in new taxes as essential to the public welfare, and then to insist upon getting nothing from new taxes—and that is the veto's net result in a practical sense—is a rule-or-ruin attitude which is as contemptuous of Congress as it is of sound public economy.

Mr. President, there is a point beyond which taxes cannot go without destroying the ability of our national economy to function. The anxiety of Congress to stop short of this breaking point may be unimpressive to the Executive, but it is not unimpressive to millions of taxpayers who are already at the breaking point.

It is easy to speak in general terms of new astronomical Federal revenues—and significantly the President has never spoken otherwise than in general terms—but it is quite something else to point the specific way. The Treasury's indefensible pattern for this bill was summarily kicked out of the window by the well-nigh unanimous attitudes of the House Ways and Means Committee, and of the Senate Finance Committee. The Treasury's pattern was ruinous. It is perfectly obvious that those committees, dealing realistically with their responsibilities, will continue to reject any such pattern, and with bipartisan eloquence. The Treasury apparently will offer no other. Yet, it glumly entrenches against any alternative pattern from any other source. Meanwhile the President is comfortably silent upon this score. He is content simply to complain.

It therefore seems equally obvious to me that this veto, if sustained, will write down the end of new revenues for 1944. If that is satisfactory to the President, he has embraced precisely the right formula to achieve such result. Even if his veto is overridden the President has already cost the Treasury \$85,000,000 in new money by postponing the effective date of this bill 1 month. That, I repeat, is a curious achievement for one who is loudly shouting for more revenue.

Mr. President, I wish particularly to advert to the renewal of the pretense by the President that the freezing of social security pay roll taxes for old-age and survivors benefits is a threat either to the integrity of the social security system, or to the adequacy of general Treasury revenues. This is the third annual time the President has tried this sophistry on Congress. Each time Congress has bluntly disagreed. In 1942 the Senate disagreed immediately following the receipt of a Presidential letter on the subject which was much stronger than the present veto. The Senate disagreed at that time by a vote of 50 to 35. It dis-

agreed again in connection with the present tax bill by a vote of 48 to 17, which is more than enough to override a veto. Coming events cast their shadow before.

Let it be made perfectly plain that the President is really not vetoing the action of Congress in respect to social-security taxes; he is really vetoing his own Secretary of the Treasury. He is vetoing Mr. Morgenthau, because it is Secretary Morgenthau's rule of thumb which the Congress has followed in deciding that the needs of social security do not require a doubling of the pay-roll taxes in 1944. Lest there still be any remaining doubt upon the subject anywhere in responsible circles, I read into the RECORD the testimony of Mr. Morgenthau which was given before the House Ways and Means Committee on March 24, 1939. I wish this might have been on the Presidential desk, although, in his present mood, perhaps it would have made no difference. I quote from Mr. Morgenthau's testimony:

We should not accumulate a reserve fund any larger than is necessary to protect the system—

He is speaking of the old-age and survivors insurance system—

against unforeseen declines in revenues or increases in the volume of benefit payments. Specifically—

Mr. Morgenthau testifying—

Specifically, I would suggest to Congress that it plan the financing of the old-age insurance system with a view to maintaining for use in emergencies an eventual reserve amounting to not more than three times the highest prospective annual benefits in the ensuing 5 years.

Mr. President, that is the rule recommended to the Congress by the President's Secretary of the Treasury; that is the rule which Congress substantially wrote into the statute in 1939 in response to the recommendation of the President's Secretary of the Treasury. The same Secretary of the Treasury, who still lingers in the Cabinet.

Remember the rule, that the reserve is adequate if it is three times the highest contemplated expenditure in any one of the ensuing 5 years. What are the facts? The immutable, indisputable facts from the Social Security Board itself, are that the reserve, instead of being only three times the highest contemplated expenditure in any one of the next 5 years, is 11 times that reserve on the basis of any normal anticipation, and, on the basis of the most exaggerated contemplation which the Social Security Board could conjure, it is still five times the necessary reserve, and far beyond the safety zone specified by the President's own Secretary of the Treasury.

I repeat, Mr. President, that this message vetoes first a member of the Cabinet. It is not justified in doing even that, because the mathematics of the situation are so plain that there can be no mistaking the net result. I can never be made to believe that substantial majorities of a responsible Congress in both the House and the Senate would have three annual times voted in this fashion, despite similar Presidential opposition,

if there could be the slightest legitimate complaint.

However, Mr. President, the veto message invites consideration of the use of the social-security tax in a different phase. I greatly welcome the forthright, frank, and square-toed statement just made by the able majority leader the distinguished Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] a few moments ago respecting the uses of social-security funds and the impropriety of consulting any collateral reason with respect to their accumulation. If the President separates his argument from the needs of social security itself and if he embraces for his theme the general needs of the general Treasury or of the general battle against inflation, he confesses a purpose to use social-security funds for other than social-security purposes, and I do not hesitate once more to assert my own belief that such an attitude is a breach of public trust. Furthermore, to use pay-roll taxes in this fashion in my opinion is to assess a discriminatory gross personal income tax—because that is precisely what it ultimately amounts to—against the lowest income groups among our workers, which is an unconscionable departure from equitable taxation principles.

Mr. President, the Executive suggests in his amazing message that this is a good time to increase the social-security tax anyway. Why? Because industry and labor are best able to adjust themselves to such increases at the present time in view of their enhanced income. Mr. President, that may be true of some industries; it may be true of some branches of labor, but it is not true of the 15,000,000 white-collar workers of this country who have just about reached the point where the last straw will break their backs, and it is not true in respect to the great mass of little business in this country which has literally been upon its knees in Washington begging that the social-security tax should be frozen, exactly as Congress has done it, and exactly as the President is undertaking to undo it. I venture the prophecy, Mr. President, that if this veto is not overridden and the pay-roll tax increases 100 percent 1 week from today the burden will be distinctly and hurtfully felt by many of the President's constituents who are entitled to be saved from this needless burden so long as it is indisputably unnecessary for the integrity of social security itself. The message will not be quite so popular 1 week from today as it is this afternoon, if it is popular at all at any time.

Mr. President, that is all I have to say about this message. I feel very deeply about it. I think—and I repeat what I said in the beginning—that the editorial in yesterday's New York Times did not overstate the fact when it is asserted, "A veto of the present bill would be an irresponsible act."

In my opinion it is an irresponsible act which springs more from a studied political campaign aimed at a fourth term on an anti-Congress platform than from any sort of elementary justification in economics or in fact.

Mr. VANDENBERG subsequently said: Mr. President, following my remarks, I should like to have the editorial in the New York Times, from which I have quoted, printed in the RECORD in full.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### ENACT THE TAX BILL

The President's remarks at his press conference last week were taken by most of his listeners to imply that he intended to veto today or tomorrow the tax bill now on his desk. We hope that this interpretation was a mistaken one. A veto of the present tax bill would be an irresponsible act.

The Treasury, it is true, had asked for a tax bill to yield an additional \$10,500,000,000. The bill actually passed by Congress is calculated to yield only an additional \$2,300,000,000. We believe this amount under present conditions to be inadequate. But it is not insubstantial (it is greatly in excess of the total revenues from the individual income tax as late as the fiscal year 1941, for example), and the Treasury could ill afford to lose it. It has been estimated that the new tax bill would increase the total Federal annual revenues to what a few years ago would have been regarded as the incredible sum of \$42,239,000,000. The practical effect of a Presidential veto, unless Congress were able to override it, would not be to force Congress to bring in a new bill increasing revenues but to deprive the Treasury even of the revenues provided by the present bill. The President's delay in acting on the bill has already, in fact, deprived the Treasury of increased excise taxes of \$85,000,000 that it could otherwise have collected in March.

The President's advisers may have told him that if he vetoes the bill the net loss in revenues will be only about half as much as those provided by the bill, because he would also be vetoing the provision in the new bill that postpones the increase that would otherwise take place in the social-security pay-roll tax. But this argument is weak on several counts. The veto would still cost the Treasury at least \$1,000,000,000 a year in net loss of revenues. And it would substitute an ill-advised tax for better taxes.

The present social-security tax is 1 percent on wage and salary earners and 1 percent on the pay rolls of employers. It yields \$1,300,000,000 a year. If the Congressional postponement were to be canceled by a Presidential veto of the tax bill, there could begin next month a 2 percent tax on wage-earners and a tax on employers of 2 percent of their pay rolls. The yield of the tax would be increased to \$2,600,000,000 a year. So far as the social-security program is itself concerned, there is no need to increase the tax rate now. The present social-security system is designed to operate on a pay-as-you-go basis. The act even provides that if the contingency reserve exceeds three times the highest yearly outlay expected during the following 5-year period Congress must be notified. The present contingency reserve is close to \$5,000,000,000. The \$1,300,000,000 in social-security taxes that we now collect is already more than six times the out-going benefit payments, and more than four times the estimated maximum outgo in 1949. So far as the social-security program itself is concerned, there is no good excuse for raising the rates now.

The argument that we should raise the social-security rates now on anti-inflation grounds implies that social-security revenues ought not to be considered merely in relation to the needs of the social-security system but rather as part of total revenues, and that the social-security system itself should be treated as part of a compensatory program of Government taxing and spending. Such an implication is a serious one for the

future of the social-security system, but it does not need to be examined here. The anti-inflation argument, even if directly applicable to the social-security program, could not justify a veto of the present bill; for such a veto would mean an annual net loss of \$1,000,000,000 in taxes.

It is worth examining, moreover, the kind of increased taxes that doubling of the social-security rates would now impose. A tax on pay rolls is a tax on employment and an increase in costs of production. Under present conditions it would force up prices further. The Government, moreover, would have to pay for its increased revenues from this source either in loss of other corporation tax revenues or in increased subsidies; so that the amount of its gain on net balance would be questionable. From the standpoint of the workers the increased tax would mean an added income tax, without exemptions, of 1 percent.

Here is a strange inconsistency in administration policy. The President has refused to accept a general retail sales tax at any level whatever, on the ground that low-income families cannot afford it. Yet a general retail sales tax of 2 percent would obviously press much less heavily on low-income families than would a flat social-security tax of 2 percent without exemptions. A retail sales tax would discourage spending, which is a highly desirable end when inflation is threatened. A family could to some extent mitigate the tax by reducing its spending. But there is no way under which an employed man can escape the flat income tax under the social-security system. It can be argued, of course, that in such a tax a man is only being forced to pay for his own future security. But does not the same argument apply to any tax to defray the costs of the present war?

This brings us back to the weaknesses of the administration's own tax program. Congress rejected that program for the sound reason that the increased taxes it proposed would have imperiled the productive processes themselves. Congress failed to compensate for this rejection by even a moderate general sales tax because the administration was flatly opposed to such a tax. How can such opposition be reconciled with an effort to increase a flat income tax without exemptions?

It is hard to believe that the President would veto the new tax bill simply because it contains a provision requiring labor unions to file financial statements with the Bureau of Internal Revenue. This is merely a mild and belated step to bring some measure of publicity and accountability into the handling of union funds. It is necessary, among other reasons, to help protect the individual union member against exploitation by unscrupulous union bosses wherever these exist.

Even if the President were otherwise justified in vetoing the new tax bill, he would not be justified in allowing Congress to waste months of precious time in framing the measure without having made unmistakably clear from the beginning precisely what he would veto and why.

If the President vetoes this measure there can be but one answer. Congress should override the veto.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the President's veto of the tax bill does not make sense. Why does he not accept the additional taxes levied, all of which were included in his program, and then ask Congress to pass another law simplifying and increasing the personal income taxes? The Treasury's original plan did not ask for \$10,500,000,000 of additional taxes but only for \$7,000,000,000 of taxes and \$3,500,000,000 of compulsory savings, which meant Government bonds. The compulsory savings feature would undoubtedly

have reduced the sale of bonds through voluntary pay-roll deductions, and would have represented no gain to the Government. The additional money the President wants, thus estimated to be about \$4,500,000,000, could be provided only by a general increase in personal income taxes or by a sales tax. A sales tax would certainly have been vetoed if it had been included in the bill. Why does not the President take the increased tax offered by the bill now?

The bill, first, increases the tax on luxuries about as the Treasury requested.

Second, it increases the excess-profits tax on corporations from 90 to 95 percent.

Third, it simplifies, while increasing slightly, the net income tax by abolishing the earned-income credit, simplifying the Victory tax, and repealing the second windfall provision.

Fourth, it improves the renegotiation provisions by providing a court review, to which every American is entitled when dealing with the Government, and exempting small business concerns with a total annual Government business of less than \$500,000.

Fifth, it freezes the social-security old-age-pension rate of 1 percent instead of letting it increase to 2 percent on the employer and 2 percent on the employee.

The President's message suggests that the increased old-age-pension money can be balanced against the additional taxes, but of course they are entirely distinct. The increase from 1 to 2 percent is not needed for social-security purposes, because the fund is already much larger than estimated. But the President proposes to borrow from the old-age-pension fund all the additional money produced by these taxes, to help finance the war. Congress does not feel that the old-age-pension funds should be used for general financing purposes.

It is unfortunate that the good features of the bill should be endangered by the President's veto, and the tax collections reduced by \$2,300,000,000 annually, simply because Congress has refused to accept the admittedly unsound recommendations of Secretary Morgenthau regarding the individual income taxes.

#### EXTENSION OF THE COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think it is the desire of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], who has today reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency Senate Joint Resolution 116, continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1945, to have it taken up for consideration tomorrow. It will be in order to do that. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be made the unfinished business, with the understanding that it will not be taken up for action until tomorrow.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 116) continuing the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States until June 30, 1945.



## EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

## EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States nominating William A. M. Burden, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce, vice W. L. Clayton, resigned, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

## POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified at once of the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be forthwith notified. That completes the calendar.

## RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 23, 1944, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate February 22 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

## ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

William A. M. Burden, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce, vice W. L. Clayton, resigned.

## CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 22 (legislative day of February 7), 1944:

## POSTMASTERS

## NEW YORK

Irene Bruno Amele, East Williamson.  
Edward J. Reidy, Elmira.  
Beulah Meier, Holtsville.

## PENNSYLVANIA

Albert R. Hinkle, Clearfield.  
Lawrence E. Oyler, Gettysburg.  
Tillie Kuchinsky, Lost Creek.  
Lucille J. Mensch, Marienville.  
Frank Mager, Matamoras.  
Donald R. Sheehan, Mehoopany.  
Hilda M. Fabian, Ottsville.  
Florence I. Risch, Sarver.

## TENNESSEE

Curtis W. Younger, Atwood.  
Katie Potts, Bon Aqua.  
Glennie K. Harrison, Cosby.  
Hollis K. Stephenson, Eagleville.  
Shafter E. Kidwell, Mohawk.  
James T. McCabe, Richard City.  
Edith D. Hill, Shouns.

## TEXAS

Leta McElligott, Bells.  
Andrew R. Davis, Brackettville.  
John A. Leinweber, Ingram.  
Sisile Curtis, Larue.  
Sallye Godbold, Leakey.  
Lura E. Seale, Lolita.  
Wayland B. Weatherred, Pampa.

## VIRGINIA

Jippie S. Yeatts, Hurt.

## WEST VIRGINIA

Jesse C. Garlow, Maidsville.  
Icie O. Anderson, Watson.  
John C. Coleman, Wilcoe.

## WYOMING

Andrew Lee Johnson, Jackson.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1944

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Help us, O God of our salvation; for the glory of Thy name deliver us and purge away our sins, so that we Thy people and the people of Thy pasture may give Thee thanks forever. O let the generations show forth the praise of the Lord and His strength and the wonderful works He hath done. We look out upon our country; may we not stray into doubt or disquietude; thwart every thought of discontent and ingratitude; unfold unto us a most promising future.

O pity the unfortunate who fail to break forth into the ecstasy of admiration because of the great achievements of our Republic; grant that the measures of patriotic ambitions may carry with them a marvelous something of the providence of Almighty God; His vital breath has been our strength and will be our security in the years to come; O anoint our souls on the mountaintop of Thy hidden might. By the valiant sacrifices of the past our soil is sacred with the billowy graves of our sons and daughters. O Lord God of the ages, with most reverent breath we pray: We bless Thee for the Virginia knight of free government, who knelt at the sacrificial altar of the Colonies with all his earthly store. Father of forgiveness, we ask for the spirit of his deep convictions which did not shimmer nor move. What tears have we wiped away, what contributions have we made to the public weal, where is our bountiful beneficence, what noble examples have we set before our people? O grant that with the giants of heart and conscience we may give noble evidence of our worthiness. In the name of the Son of God. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced

that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 149. An act to fix a reasonable definition and standard of identity of certain dry milk solids.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 35. Concurrent resolution to print, with additional copies, the so-called Earuch Report on War and Post-War Adjustment Policy.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 872) entitled "An act to authorize the President to appoint Frank T. Hines a brigadier general in the Army of the United States," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. HILL, and Mr. AUSTIN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

## WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] will read Washington's Farewell Address.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico read as follows:

## To the people of the United States:

FRIENDS AND FELLOW CITIZENS: The period for a new election of a citizen to administer the executive government of the United States being not far distant, and the time actually arrived when your thoughts must be employed in designating the person who is to be clothed with that important trust, it appears to me proper, especially as it may conduce to a more distinct expression of the public voice, that I should now apprise you of the resolution I have formed, to decline being considered among the number of those, out of whom a choice is to be made.

I beg you, at the same time, to do me the justice to be assured, that this resolution has not been taken, without a strict regard to all the considerations appertaining to the relation which binds a dutiful citizen to his country; and that, in withdrawing the tender of service which silence in my situation might imply, I am influenced by no diminution of zeal for your future interest; no deficiency of grateful respect for your past kindness; but am supported by a full conviction that the step is compatible with both.

The acceptance of, and continuance hitherto in the office to which your suffrages have twice called me, have been a uniform sacrifice of inclination to the opinion of duty, and to a deference for what appeared to be your desire. I constantly hoped that it would have been much earlier in my power, consistently with motives which I was not at liberty to disregard, to return to that retirement from which I had been reluctantly drawn. The strength of my inclination to do this, previous to the last election, had even led to the preparation of an address to declare it to you; but mature reflection on the then perplexed and

critical posture of our affairs with foreign nations, and the unanimous advice of persons entitled to my confidence, impelled me to abandon the idea.

I rejoice that the state of your concerns, external as well as internal, no longer renders the pursuit of inclination incompatible with the sentiment of duty or propriety; and am persuaded, whatever partiality may be retained for my services, that in the present circumstances of our country, you will not disapprove my determination to retire.

The impressions with which I first undertook the arduous trust, were explained on the proper occasion. In the discharge of this trust, I will only say that I have, with good intentions, contributed towards the organization and administration of the government, the best exertions of which a very fallible judgment was capable. Not unconscious in the outset, of the inferiority of my qualifications, experience, in my own eyes, perhaps still more in the eyes of others, has strengthened the motives to diffidence of myself; and, every day, the increasing weight of years admonishes me more and more, that the shade of retirement is as necessary to me as it will be welcome. Satisfied that if any circumstances have given peculiar value to my services they were temporary, I have the consolation to believe that, while choice and prudence invite me to quit the political scene, patriotism does not forbid it.

In looking forward to the moment which is to terminate the career of my political life, my feelings do not permit me to suspend the deep acknowledgment of that debt of gratitude which I owe to my beloved country, for the many honors it has conferred upon me; still more for the steadfast confidence with which it has supported me; and for the opportunities I have thence enjoyed of manifesting my inviolable attachment, by services faithful and persevering, though in usefulness unequal to my zeal. If benefits have resulted to our country from these services, let it always be remembered to your praise, and as an instructive example in our annals, that under circumstances in which the passions, agitated in every direction, were liable to mislead amidst appearances sometimes dubious, vicissitudes of fortune often discouraging—in situations in which not unfrequently, want of success has countenanced the spirit of criticism—the constancy of your support was the essential prop of the efforts, and a guarantee of the plans, by which they were effected. Profoundly penetrated with this idea, I shall carry it with me to my grave, as a strong incitement to unceasing vows that heaven may continue to you the choicest tokens of its beneficence—that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual—that the free constitution, which is the work of your hands, may be sacredly maintained—that its administration in every department may be stamped with wisdom and virtue—that, in fine, the happiness of the people of these states, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation, and so prudent a use of this blessing, as will

acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection, and adoption of every nation which is yet a stranger to it.

Here, perhaps, I ought to stop. But a solicitude for your welfare, which cannot end but with my life, and the apprehension of danger, natural to that solicitude, urge me, on an occasion like the present, to offer to your solemn contemplation, and to recommend to your frequent review, some sentiments which are the result of much reflection, of no inconsiderable observation, and which appear to me all important to the permanency of your felicity as a people. These will be offered to you with the more freedom, as you can only see in them the disinterested warnings of a parting friend, who can possibly have no personal motive to bias his counsel. Nor can I forget, as an encouragement to it, your indulgent reception of my sentiments on a former and not dissimilar occasion.

Interwoven as is the love of liberty with every ligament of your hearts, no recommendation of mine is necessary to fortify or confirm the attachment.

The unity of government which constitutes you one people, is also now dear to you. It is justly so; for it is a main pillar in the edifice of your real independence; the support of your tranquility at home; your peace abroad; of your safety; of your prosperity; of that very liberty which you so highly prize. But as it is easy to foresee that, from different causes and from different quarters much pains will be taken, many artifices employed, to weaken in your minds the conviction of this truth; as this is the point in your political fortress against which the batteries of internal and external enemies will be most constantly and actively (though often covertly and insidiously) directed; it is of infinite moment, that you should properly estimate the immense value of your national union to your collective and individual happiness; that you should cherish a cordial, habitual, and immovable attachment to it; accustoming yourselves to think and speak of it as of the palladium of your political safety and prosperity; watching for its preservation with jealous anxiety; discountenancing whatever may suggest even a suspicion that it can, in any event, be abandoned; and indignantly frowning upon the first dawning of every attempt to alienate any portion of our country from the rest, or to enfeeble the sacred ties which now link together the various parts.

For this you have every inducement of sympathy and interest. Citizens by birth, or choice, of a common country, that country has a right to concentrate your affections. The name of American, which belongs to you in your national capacity, must always exalt the just pride of patriotism, more than any appellation derived from local discriminations. With slight shades of difference, you have the same religion, manners, habits, and political principles. You have, in a common cause, fought and triumphed together; the independence and liberty you possess, are the work of joint counsels, and joint efforts, of common dangers, sufferings and successes.

But these considerations, however powerfully they addressed themselves to your sensibility, are greatly outweighed by those which apply more immediately to your interest.—Here, every portion of our country finds the most commanding motives for carefully guarding and preserving the union of the whole.

The *north*, in an unrestrained intercourse with the *south*, protected by the equal laws of a common government, finds in the productions of the latter, great additional resources of maritime and commercial enterprise, and precious materials of manufacturing industry.—The *south*, in the same intercourse, benefiting by the same agency of the *north*, sees its agriculture grow and its commerce expand. Turning partly into its own channels the seamen of the *north*, it finds its particular navigation invigorated; and while it contributes, in different ways, to nourish and increase the general mass of the national navigation, it looks forward to the protection of a maritime strength, to which itself is unequally adapted. The *east*, in a like intercourse with the *west*, already finds, and in the progressive improvement of interior communications by land and water, will more and more find a valuable vent for the commodities which it brings from abroad, or manufactures at home. The *west* derives from the *east* supplies requisite to its growth and comfort—and what is perhaps of still greater consequence, it must of necessity owe the secure enjoyment of indispensable outlets for its own productions, to the weight, influence, and the future maritime strength of the Atlantic side of the Union, directed by an indissoluble community of interest as *one nation*. Any other tenure by which the *west* can hold this essential advantage, whether derived from its own separate strength; or from an apostate and unnatural connection with any foreign power, must be intrinsically precarious.

While then every part of our country thus feels an immediate and particular interest in union, all the parts combined cannot fail to find in the united mass of means and efforts, greater strength, greater resource, proportionably greater security from external danger, a less frequent interruption of their peace by foreign nations; and, what is of inestimable value, they must derive from union, an exemption from those broils and wars between themselves, which so frequently afflict neighboring countries not tied together by the same government; which their own rivalry alone would be sufficient to produce, but which opposite foreign alliances, attachments, and intrigues, would stimulate and embitter. Hence likewise, they will avoid the necessity of those overgrown military establishments, which under any form of government are inauspicious to liberty, and which are to be regarded as particularly hostile to republican liberty. In this sense it is, that your union ought to be considered as a main prop of your liberty, and that the love of the one ought to endear to you the preservation of the other.

These considerations speak a persuasive language to every reflecting and virtuous



mind and exhibit the continuance of the union as a primary object of patriotic desire. Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? let experience solve it. To listen to mere speculation in such a case were criminal. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole, with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions, will afford a happy issue to the experiment. It is well worth a fair and full experiment. With such powerful and obvious motives to union, affecting all parts of our country, while experience shall not have demonstrated its impracticability, there will always be reason to distrust the patriotism of those who, in any quarter, may endeavor to weaken its hands.

In contemplating the causes which may disturb our Union, it occurs as matter of serious concern, that any ground should have been furnished for characterizing parties by *geographical* discriminations,—*northern and southern*—*Atlantic and western*; whence designing men may endeavor to excite a belief that there is a real difference of local interests and views. One of the expedients of party to acquire influence within particular districts, is to misrepresent the opinions and aims of other districts. You cannot shield yourselves too much against the jealousies and heart burnings which spring from these misrepresentations; they tend to render alien to each other those who ought to be bound together by fraternal affection. The inhabitants of our western country have lately had a useful lesson on this head; they have seen, in the negotiation by the executive, and in the unanimous ratification by the senate of the treaty with Spain, and in the universal satisfaction at the event throughout the United States, a decisive proof how unfounded were the suspicions propagated among them of a policy in the general government and in the Atlantic states, unfriendly to their interests in regard to the Mississippi. They have been witnesses to the formation of two treaties, that with Great Britain and that with Spain, which secure to them everything they could desire, in respect to our foreign relations, towards confirming their prosperity. Will it not be their wisdom to rely for the preservation of these advantages on the union by which they were procured? will they not henceforth be deaf to those advisers, if such they are, who would sever them from their brethren and connect them with aliens?

To the efficacy and permanency of your Union, a government for the whole is indispensable. No alliances, however strict, between the parts can be an adequate substitute; they must inevitably experience the infractions and interruptions which all alliances, in all times, have experienced. Sensible of this momentous truth, you have improved upon your first essay, by the adoption of a constitution of government, better calculated than your former, for an intimate union, and for the efficacious management of your common concerns. This government, the offspring of our own choice, uninfluenced and unawed, adopted upon

full investigation and mature deliberation, completely free in its principles, in the distribution of its powers, uniting security with energy, and maintaining within itself a provision for its own amendment, has a just claim to your confidence and your support. Respect for its authority, compliance with its laws, acquiescence in its measures, are duties enjoined by the fundamental maxims of true liberty. The basis of our political systems is the right of the people to make and to alter their constitutions of government.—But the constitution which at any time exists, until changed by an explicit and authentic act of the whole people, is sacredly obligatory upon all. The very idea of the power, and the right of the people to establish government, presuppose the duty of every individual to obey the established government.

All obstructions to the execution of the laws, all combinations and associations under whatever plausible character, with the real design to direct, control, counteract, or awe the regular deliberations and action of the constituted authorities, are destructive of this fundamental principle, and of fatal tendency.—They serve to organize faction, to give it an artificial and extraordinary force, to put in the place of the delegated will of the nation the will of party, often a small but artful and enterprising minority of the community; and, according to the alternate triumphs of different parties, to make the public administration the mirror of the ill concerted and incongruous projects of faction, rather than the organ of consistent and wholesome plans digested by common councils, and modified by mutual interests.

However, combinations or associations of the above description may now and then answer popular ends, they are likely, in the course of time and things, to become potent engines, by which cunning, ambitious, and unprincipled men, will be enabled to subvert the power of the people, and to usurp for themselves the reins of government; destroying afterwards the very engines which have lifted them to unjust dominion.

Towards the preservation of your government and the permanency of your present happy state, it is requisite, not only that you steadily discountenance irregular opposition to its acknowledged authority, but also that you resist with care the spirit of innovation upon its principles, however specious the pretext. One method of assault may be to effect, in the forms of the constitution, alterations which will impair the energy of the system; and thus to undermine what cannot be directly overthrown. In all the changes to which you may be invited, remember that time and habit are at least as necessary to fix the true character of governments, as of other human institutions:—that experience is the surest standard by which to test the real tendency of the existing constitution of a country:—that facility in changes, upon the credit of mere hypothesis and opinion, expose to perpetual change from the endless variety of hypothesis and opinion: and remember, especially, that for the efficient management of your

common interests in a country so extensive as ours, a government of as much vigor as is consistent with the perfect security of liberty is indispensable. Liberty itself will find in such a government, with powers properly distributed and adjusted, its surest guardian. It is, indeed, little else than a name, where the government is too feeble to withstand the enterprises of faction, to confine each member of the society within the limits prescribed by the laws, and to maintain all in the secure and tranquil enjoyment of the rights of person and property.

I have already intimated to you the danger of parties in the state, with particular references to the founding them on geographical discrimination. Let me now take a more comprehensive view, and warn you in the most solemn manner against the baneful effects of the spirit of party generally.

This spirit, unfortunately, is inseparable from our nature, having its root in the strongest passions of the human mind.—It exists under different shapes in all governments, more or less stifled, controlled, or repressed; but in those of the popular form it is seen in its greatest rankness, and is truly their worst enemy.

The alternate domination of one faction over another, sharpened by the spirit of revenge natural to party dissension, which in different ages and countries has perpetrated the most horrid enormities, is itself a frightful despotism.—But this leads at length to a more formal and permanent despotism. The disorders and miseries which result, gradually incline the minds of men to seek security and repose in the absolute power of an individual; and, sooner or later, the chief of some prevailing faction, more able or more fortunate than his competitors, turns this disposition to the purpose of his own elevation on the ruins of public liberty.

Without looking forward to an extremity of this kind, (which nevertheless ought not to be entirely out of sight) the common and continual mischiefs of the spirit or party are sufficient to make it the interest and duty of a wise people to discourage and restrain it.

It serves always to distract the public councils, and enfeeble the public administration. It agitates the community with ill founded jealousies and false alarms; kindles the animosity of one part against another; foment occasional riot and insurrection. It opens the door to foreign influence and corruption, which finds a facilitated access to the government itself through the channels of party passions. Thus the policy and the will of one country are subjected to the policy and will of another.

There is an opinion that parties in free countries are useful checks upon the administration of the government, and serve to keep alive the spirit of liberty. This within certain limits is probably true; and in governments of a monarchical cast, patriotism may look with indulgence, if not with favor, upon the spirit of party. But in those of the popular character, in governments purely elective, it is a spirit not to be encouraged. From their natural tendency, it is certain

there will always be enough of that spirit for every salutary purpose. And there being constant danger of excess, the effort ought to be, by force of public opinion, to mitigate and assuage it. A fire not to be quenched, it demands a uniform vigilance to prevent it bursting into a flame, lest instead of warming, it should consume.

It is important likewise, that the habits of thinking in a free country should inspire caution in those intrusted with its administration, to confine themselves within their respective constitutional spheres, avoiding in the exercise of the powers of one department, to encroach upon another. The spirit of encroachment tends to consolidate the powers of all the departments in one, and thus to create, whatever the form of government, a real despotism. A just estimate of that love of power and proneness to abuse it which predominate in the human heart, is sufficient to satisfy us of the truth of this position. The necessity of reciprocal checks in the exercise of political power, by dividing and distributing it into different depositories, and constituting each the guardian of the public weal against invasions of the others, has been evinced by experiments ancient and modern; some of them in our country and under our own eyes.—To preserve them must be as necessary as to institute them. If, in the opinion of the people, the distribution or modification of the constitutional powers be in any particular wrong, let it be corrected by an amendment in the way which the constitution designates.—But let there be no change by usurpation; for though this, in one instance, may be the instrument of good, it is the customary weapon by which free governments are destroyed. The precedent must always greatly overbalance in permanent evil any partial or transient benefit which the use can at any time yield.

Of all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports. In vain would that man claim the tribute of patriotism, who should labor to subvert these great pillars of human happiness, these firmest props of the duties of men and citizens. The mere politician, equally with the pious man, ought to respect and to cherish them. A volume could not trace all their connections with private and public felicity. Let it simply be asked, where is the security for property, for reputation, for life, if the sense of religious obligation *desert* the oaths which are the instruments of investigation in courts of justice? And let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can be maintained without religion. Whatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect, that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle.

It is substantially true, that virtue or morality is a necessary spring of popular government. The rule, indeed extends with more or less force to every species of free government. Who that is a sincere friend to it can look with indifference upon attempts to shake the foundation of the fabric?

Promote, then, as an object of primary importance, institutions for the general diffusion of knowledge. In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it should be enlightened.

As a very important source of strength and security, cherish public credit. One method of preserving it is to use it as sparingly as possible, avoiding occasions of expense by cultivating peace, but remembering, also, that timely disbursements, to prepare for danger, frequently prevent much greater disbursements to repel it; avoiding likewise the accumulation of debt, not only by shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions, in time of peace, to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear. The execution of these maxims belongs to your representatives, but it is necessary that public opinion should cooperate. To facilitate to them the performance of their duty, it is essential that you should practically bear in mind, that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes, that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant; that the intrinsic embarrassment inseparable from the selection of the proper object (which is always a choice of difficulties,) ought to be a decisive motive for a candid construction of the conduct of the government in making it, and for a spirit of acquiescence in the measures for obtaining revenue, which the public exigencies may at any time dictate.

Observe good faith and justice towards all nations; cultivate peace and harmony with all. Religion and morality enjoin this conduct, and can it be that good policy does not equally enjoin it? It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence. Who can doubt but, in the course of time and things, the fruits of such a plan would richly repay any temporary advantages which might be lost by a steady adherence to it; can it be that Providence has not connected the permanent felicity of a nation with its virtue? The experiment, at least is recommended by every sentiment which ennobles human nature. Alas! is it rendered impossible by its vices?

In the execution of such a plan, nothing is more essential than that permanent, inveterate antipathies against particular nations and passionate attachments for others, should be excluded; and that, in place of them, just and amicable feelings towards all should be cultivated. The nation which indulges towards another an habitual hatred, or an habitual fondness, is in some degree a slave. It is a slave to its animosity or to its affection, either of which is sufficient to lead it astray from its duty and its interest. Antipathy in one nation against another disposes each more readily to offer insult and injury, to lay hold of slight causes of umbrage, and to be haughty and intractable when accidental or trifling oc-

casions of dispute occur. Hence, frequent collisions, obstinate, envenomed, and bloody contests. The nation, prompted by ill will and resentment, sometimes impels to war the government, contrary to the best calculations of policy. The government sometimes participates in the national propensity, and adopts through passion what reason would reject; at other times, it makes the animosity of the nation subservient to projects of hostility, instigated by pride, ambition, and other sinister and pernicious motives. The peace often, sometimes perhaps the liberty of nations, has been the victim.

So likewise, a passionate attachment of one nation for another produces a variety of evils. Sympathy for the favorite nation, facilitating the illusion of an imaginary common interest, in cases where no real common interest exists, and infusing into one the enmities of the other, betrays the former into a participation in the quarrels and wars of the latter, without adequate inducements or justifications. It leads also to concessions, to the favorite nation, of privileges denied to others, which is apt doubly to injure the nation making the concessions, by unnecessarily parting with what ought to have been retained, and by exciting jealousy, ill will, and a disposition to retaliate in the parties from whom equal privileges are withheld; and it gives to ambitious, corrupted or deluded citizens who devote themselves to the favorite nation, facility to betray or sacrifice the interests of their own country, without odium, sometimes even with popularity; gilding with the appearances of a virtuous sense of obligation, a commendable deference for public opinion, or a laudable zeal for public good, the base or foolish compliances of ambition, corruption, or infatuation.

As avenues to foreign influence in innumerable ways, such attachments are particularly alarming to the truly enlightened and independent patriot. How many opportunities do they afford to tamper with domestic factions, to practice the arts of seduction, to mislead public opinion, to influence or awe the public councils!—Such an attachment of a small or weak, towards a great and powerful nation, dooms the former to be the satellite of the latter.

Against the insidious wiles of foreign influence, (I conjure you to believe me fellow citizens,) the jealousy of a free people ought to be *constantly* awake; since history and experience prove, that foreign influence is one of the most baneful foes of republican government. But that jealousy, to be useful, must be impartial, else it becomes the instrument of the very influence to be avoided, instead of a defense against it. Excessive partiality for one foreign nation and excessive dislike for another, cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and



confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

The great rule of conduct for us, in regard to foreign nations, is, in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little *political* connection as possible. So far as we have already formed engagements, let them be fulfilled with perfect good faith:—Here let us stop.

Europe has a set of primary interests, which to us have none, or a very remote relation. Hence, she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves, by artificial ties, in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships or enmities.

Our detached and distant situation invites and enables us to pursue a different course. If we remain one people, under an efficient government, the period is not far off when we may defy material injury from external annoyance; when we may take such an attitude as will cause the neutrality we may at any time resolve upon, to be scrupulously respected; when belligerent nations, under the impossibility of making acquisitions upon us, will not lightly hazard the giving us provocation, when we may choose peace or war, as our interest, guided by justice, shall counsel.

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliance with any portion of the foreign world; so far, I mean, as we are now at liberty to do it; for let me not be understood as capable of patronizing infidelity to existing engagements. I hold the maxim no less applicable to public than private affairs, that honesty is always the best policy. I repeat it, therefore, let those engagements be observed in their genuine sense. But in my opinion, it is unnecessary, and would be unwise to extend them.

Taking care always to keep ourselves by suitable establishments, on a respectable defensive posture, we may safely trust to temporary alliances for extraordinary emergencies.

Harmony, and a liberal intercourse with all nations, are recommended by policy, humanity, and interest. But even our commercial policy should hold an equal and impartial hand: neither seeking nor granting exclusive favors or preferences; consulting the natural course of things; diffusing and diversifying by gentle means the streams of commerce, but forcing nothing; establishing with powers so disposed, in order to give trade a stable course, to define the rights of our merchants, and to enable the government to support them, conventional rules of intercourse, the best that present circumstances and mutual opinion will permit, but temporary, and liable to be from time to time abandoned or varied as

experience and circumstances shall dictate; constantly keeping in view, that it is folly in one nation to look for disinterested favors from another; that it must pay with a portion of its independence for whatever it may accept under that character; that by such acceptance, it may place itself in the condition of having given equivalents for nominal favors, and yet of being reproached with ingratitude for not giving more. There can be no greater error than to expect, or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation. It is an illusion which experience must cure, which a just pride ought to discard.

In offering to you, my countrymen, these counsels of an old and affectionate friend, I dare not hope they will make the strong and lasting impression I could wish; that they will control the usual current of the passions, or prevent our nation from running the course which has hitherto marked the destiny of nations, but if I may even flatter myself that they may be productive of some partial benefit, some occasional good; that they may now and then recur to moderate the fury of party spirit, to warn against the mischiefs of foreign intrigue, to guard against the impostures of pretended patriotism; this hope will be a full recompense for the solicitude for your welfare by which they have been dictated.

How far, in the discharge of my official duties, I have been guided by the principles which have been delineated, the public records and other evidences of my conduct must witness to you and to the world. To myself, the assurance of my own conscience is, that I have, at least, believed myself to be guided by them.

In relation to the still subsisting war in Europe; my proclamation of the 22d of April, 1793, is the index to my plan. Sanctioned by your approving voice, and by that of your representatives in both houses of congress, the spirit of that measure has continually governed me, uninfluenced by any attempts to deter or divert me from it.

After deliberate examination, with the aid of the best lights I could obtain, I was well satisfied that our country, under all the circumstances of the case, had a right to take, and was bound, in duty and interest, to take a neutral position. Having taken it, I determined, as far as should depend upon me, to maintain it with moderation, perseverance, and firmness.

The considerations which respect the right to hold this conduct, it is not necessary on this occasion to detail. I will only observe that, according to my understanding of the matter, that right, so far from being denied by any of the belligerent powers, has been virtually admitted by all.

The duty of holding a neutral conduct may be inferred, without any thing more, from the obligation which justice and humanity impose on every nation, in cases in which it is free to act, to maintain inviolate the relations of peace and amity towards other nations.

The inducements of interest for observing that conduct will best be referred to your own reflections and experience.

With me a predominant motive has been to endeavor to gain time to our country to settle and mature its yet recent institutions, and to progress, without interruption, to that degree of strength, and consistency which is necessary to give it, humanly speaking, the command of its own fortunes.

Though in reviewing the incidents of my administration, I am unconscious of intentional error, I am nevertheless too sensible of my defects not to think it probable that I may have committed many errors. Whatever they may be, I fervently beseech the Almighty to avert or mitigate the evils to which they may tend. I shall also carry with me the hope that my country will never cease to view them with indulgence; and that, after forty-five years of my life dedicated to its service, with an upright zeal, the faults of incompetent abilities will be consigned to oblivion, as myself must soon be to the mansions of rest.

Relying on its kindness in this as in other things, and actuated by that fervent love towards it, which is so natural to a man who views in it the native soil of himself and his progenitors for several generations; I anticipate with pleasing expectation that retreat in which I promise myself to realize without alloy, the sweet enjoyment of partaking, in the midst of my fellow citizens, the benign influence of good laws under a free government—the ever favorite object of my heart, and the happy reward, as I trust, of our mutual cares, labors, and dangers.

GEO. WASHINGTON.

UNITED STATES,  
17th September, 1796.

#### VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—THE REVENUE ACT OF 1944 (I. DOC. NO. 443)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read:

#### To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 3687, entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes."

I regret that I find it necessary in the midst of this great war to be compelled to do this in what I regard as the public interest.

Many months ago, after careful examination of the finances of the Nation, I asked the Congress for legislation to raise \$10,500,000,000 over and above the existing revenue system. Since then persons prominent in our national life have stated in no uncertain terms that my figure was too low.

The measure before me purports to increase the national revenue by a little over \$2,000,000,000. Actually, however, the bill in its net results will enrich the Treasury by less than \$1,000,000,000.

As a tax bill, therefore, I am compelled to decide that it is wholly ineffective toward that end.

More specifically the bill purports to provide \$2,100,000,000 in new revenues. At the same time it cancels out automatic increases in the social-security tax which would yield \$1,100,000,000. In ad-

dition it grants relief from existing taxes which would cost the Treasury at least \$150,000,000 and possibly much more.

In this respect it is not a tax bill but a tax relief bill providing relief not for the needy but for the greedy.

The elimination of automatic increases provided in the social-security law comes at a time when industry and labor are best able to adjust themselves to such increases. These automatic increases are required to meet the claims that are being built up against the social-security fund. Such a postponement does not seem wise.

The clause relating to renegotiating of war contracts terminates the present renegotiation authority on December 31 of this year. This seems unwise at this time because no person can at present determine what a renegotiation time limit should be. More experience is needed. The formal right of appeal to the Tax Court that is granted by this bill is an inept provision. The present Tax Court exists for a wholly different purpose and does not have the personnel or the time to assume this heavy load.

The bill is replete with provisions which not only afford indefensible special privileges to favored groups but sets dangerous precedents for the future. This tendency toward the embodiment of special privileges in our legislation is in itself sufficiently dangerous to counterbalance the loss of a very inadequate sum in additional revenues.

Among these special privileges are:

(a) Permission for corporations reorganized in bankruptcy to retain the high excess-profits credit and depreciation basis attributable to the contributions of stockholders who are usually eliminated in the reorganization. This privilege inures to the benefit of bondholders who, in many cases, have purchased their bonds in the speculative market for far less than their face value. It may open the door to further windfall profits in this market because of the undeserved benefit received by reorganized corporations.

(b) Percentage depletion allowances, questionable in any case, are now extended to such minerals as vermiculite, potash, feldspar, mica, talc, lepidolite, barite, and spodumene. In the case of some of these minerals the War Production Board refused to certify that current output was inadequate for war needs.

(c) The lumber industry is permitted to treat income from the cutting of timber, including selective logging, as a capital gain rather than annual income. As a grower and seller of timber, I think that timber should be treated as a crop and therefore as income when it is sold. This would encourage reforestation.

(d) Natural gas pipe lines are exempted from the excess-profits tax without justification and in a manner which might well lead oil companies to request similar treatment for their pipe lines.

(e) Commercial air lines are granted an unjustifiable extension of the tax subsidy on their air-mail contracts.

It has been suggested by some that I should give my approval to this bill on the ground that having asked the Con-

gress for a loaf of bread to take care of this war for the sake of this and succeeding generations, I should be content with a small piece of crust. I might have done so if I had not noted that the small piece of crust contained so many extraneous and inedible materials.

In regard to that part of the bill which relates to wholly unobjectionable tax increases, may I respectfully suggest to the Congress that the excise taxes can easily and quickly be levied. This can be accomplished by the passage of a simple joint resolution enacting those provisions of the bill which increase the excise taxes. I should be glad to approve such a measure. This would preserve the principal revenue provisions of the bill without the objectionable features I have criticized.

In another most important respect this bill would disappoint and fail the American taxpayers. Every one of them, including ourselves, is disappointed, confused and bewildered over the practical results of last year's tax bill. The Ruml plan was not the product of this administration. It resulted from a widespread campaign based on the attractive slogan of "Pay-as-you-go." But, as was said many years ago in the State of New York in regard to that same slogan "You don't pay and you don't go."

The Nation will readily understand that it is not the fault of the Treasury Department that the income taxpayers are flooded with forms to fill out which are so complex that even certified public accountants cannot interpret them. No, it is squarely the fault of the Congress of the United States in using language in drafting the law which not even a dictionary or a thesaurus can make clear.

The American taxpayer has been promised of late that tax laws and returns will be drastically simplified. This bill does not make good that promise. It ignores the most obvious step toward simplifying taxes by failing to eliminate the clumsy Victory tax. For fear of dropping from the tax rolls those taxpayers who are at the bottom of the income scale, the bill retains the Victory tax—while at the same time it grants extensive concessions to many special-interest groups.

The suggestion of withholding at graduated rates, which would relieve millions of people of the task of filing declarations of estimated income, was not adopted.

I trust, therefore, that the Congress, after all these delays, will act as quickly as possible for simplification of the tax laws which will make possible the simplification of the forms and computations now demanded of the individual taxpayers. These taxpayers, now engaged in an effort to win the greatest war this Nation has ever faced, are not in a mood to study higher mathematics.

The responsibility of the Congress of the United States is to supply the Government of the United States as a whole with adequate revenue for wartime needs, to provide fiscal support for the stabilization program, to hold firm against the tide of special privileges, and to achieve real simplicity for millions of small-income taxpayers.

In the interest of strengthening the home front, in the interest of speeding the day of victory, I urge the earliest possible action.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 22, 1944.

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the message and accompanying document will be printed as a House document.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to postpone further consideration of the President's message until Thursday next, February 24.

The motion was agreed to.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter that appeared in the New York Times on Sunday, February 20.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(Mr. NORMAN and Mr. MONKIEWICZ asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the death of our late colleague Leonard Schuetz.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts from a committee report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY], I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.



Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following the remarks of our distinguished chairman the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio? There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JENKINS], I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York? There was no objection.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following the remarks of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by Judge Marvin Jones entitled "Corn Goes to War."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa? There was no objection.

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota? There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Los Angeles Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin? There was no objection.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas? There was no objection.

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following

the remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLS], I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, following the remarks of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CAMP], I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin? There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short article, and further to extend my remarks and include therein a radio speech I made on George Washington.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two short newspaper excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? There was no objection.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on February 21, 1944, present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3193. An act for the relief of J. C. Davidson and Vassie Lee Davidson;

H. R. 3298. An act for the relief of Nels J. Pedersen; and

H. R. 3351. An act for the relief of Howard L. Pemberton.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 23, 1944, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

##### COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 a. m. Wednesday, February 23, 1944, in the caucus room of the old House Office Building, for the consideration of post-war planning.

##### COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents will hold a public hearing on Thursday, February 24, 1944, at 10 a. m. to consider H. R. 3264, to amend the patent laws.

##### SCHEDULE OF HEARINGS ON FLOOD-CONTROL BILL OF 1944, BEGINNING TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 1, 1944, AT 10 A. M.

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the hearings conducted in June 1943, and on amendments to existing law. The committee is definitely committed to the view that flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works and the committee plans an adequate backing of sound flood-control projects available following the war.

Wednesday, February 23: Senators and Representatives in Congress.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1215. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a copy of his order canceling certain charges existing as debts due the United States by individual Indians and tribes of Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

1216. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize increases in wages for certain employees of The Alaska Railroad for services rendered from May 1, 1943, to

September 30, 1943, inclusive; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

1217. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to expatriate or exclude certain persons for evading military and naval service; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Senate Joint Resolution 77. Joint resolution to establish a Board of Visitors for the United States Merchant Marine Academy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. House Joint Resolution 161. Joint resolution to provide cash awards to personnel of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration for useful suggestions to improve administration of their activities; with amendments (Rept. No. 1167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS:

H. R. 4242. A bill to authorize an examination and survey with a view to the improvement and protection of the beaches along the coast of New Jersey from Sandy Hook to Cape May; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LARCADE:

H. R. 4243. A bill to extend the time for filing certain applications for insurance payments under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 4244. A bill to reimburse certain Coast and Geodetic Survey and Marine Corps personnel for personal property lost or damaged as the result of a fire at the marine barracks, Quantico, Va., on December 16, 1943; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROWAN:

H. R. 4245. A bill for the relief of all temporary substitutes in the Postal Service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution to establish a joint committee to prepare plans for the observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary in 1946 of the signing and publication of Washington's Farewell Address; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 4246. A bill for the relief of John Bud Townsend; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 4247. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jessie McManus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. R. 4248. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Louis Ciniglio; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEST:

H. R. 4249. A bill for the relief of the estate of Eura Reid; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5004. By Mr. AUCHINCLOSS: Petition of the Business and Professional Women's Club of Toms River, N. J., urging abrogation of British white paper and allowance of Jewish immigration into Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5005. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Charles P. Roberts and 19 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5006. Also, petition of Dolton Durham and 19 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5007. Also, petition of Paul D. Sidley and 19 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5008. Also, petition of C. A. Woxman and 18 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5009. Also, petition of Cyrus F. Gatewood and 19 others, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082, which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5010. Also, petition of Zollic C. Carpenter, of the United Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers of America, St. Louis, Mo., and signed by hundreds of St. Louis citizens, petitioning Congress to pass the soldier-vote bill in the following language: Who has a better right to vote? My kin are fighting for their country and for democracy. No one dare make it difficult for them or interfere with their right to vote. I respectfully request that you do everything in your power, by your vote and your action on the floor of Congress, to pass the soldier-vote bill which will allow the Federal Government to make it easily possible for all men and women in the armed services to vote; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

5011. By Mr. HART: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, memorializing the Congress of the United States to use its prestige to cause the doors of Palestine to be opened for Jewish immigration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5012. By Mr. HESS: Petition of 1,000 citizens of Cincinnati, Ohio, and vicinity, protesting against any legislation to bring back national prohibition of the sale of liquor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5013. By Mr. KELLEY: Petition of the thirty-seventh annual meeting of the Lumber Dealers' Association of Western Pennsylvania, requesting simplification of the tax laws and other subjects; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5014. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Philadelphia assembled under auspices of Palestine open-door committee, supporting unrestricted Jewish immigration to Palestine; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5015. Also, petition of various members of Local 612 of the United Electrical, Radio & Machine Workers of America, Derry, Pa., supporting a soldier-vote bill to make it easily possible for all men and women in the armed services to vote in Federal elections; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

5016. Also, petition of the Olivet Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring America's participation in establishing a

Christian world order and government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5017. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Westmoreland County, Pa., in support of Resolutions 418 and 419; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5018. By Mr. LAFOLLETTE: Petition of A. Armbruster and 458 other residents of Floyd County, Ind., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5019. Also, petition of Forest Tignor and 49 other residents of Rockport, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5020. Also, petition of Roy Martin and 22 other residents of Rockport, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5021. Also, petition of Russell Herron and 32 other citizens of Rockport, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5022. Also, petition of Floyd W. Swallow and 49 other residents of Richland and Rockport, Ind., protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5023. Also, petition of James C. Horne and 24 other residents of Richland, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5024. Also, petition of James Yellig and 49 other residents of Mariah Hill, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5025. Also, petition of J. W. Bacon and 36 other residents of Lynnville, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5026. Also, petition of Chris C. Tremper and 47 other residents of Grandview, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5027. Also, petition of John C. Nicholson and 49 other residents of Elberfeld, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5028. Also, petition of George Snyder and 49 other residents of Dale, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5029. Also, petition of Herbert Helmich and 75 other residents of Chrisney, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5030. Also, petition of Harry Killebren and 43 residents of Boonville, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5031. Also, petition of Charles Miles and 40 other residents of Boonville, Ind., and vicinity, protesting against the enactment of any and all prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5032. By Mr. LEWIS: Petition signed by 753 residents of East Liverpool, Salem, and Steubenville, Ohio, protesting against the passage of any such prohibition legislation as the Bryson bill (H. R. 2082); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5033. By Mr. MERRROW: Petitions signed by 28 residents of Berlin, N. H., urging support of House Resolution No. 418; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5034. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition signed by 137 voters from 17 Vermont towns, protesting against prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5035. By Mr. ROLPH: Petition of the National Maritime Union of San Francisco, with



reference to grade labeling; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5036. Also, petition of the National Maritime Union of San Francisco, with reference to subsidies; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

5037. Also, petition of the congregation of Emanu-El of San Francisco, abrogating Chamberlain white paper; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5038. Also, petition of the Sisterhood Temple, Sherith Israel, of San Francisco, abrogating Chamberlain white paper; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5039. Also, petition of the Jewish War Veterans Ladies Auxiliary, No. 152, of San Francisco, abrogating the Chamberlain white paper; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5040. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of C. W. Griesser and others of Joplin, Jasper, and Newton Counties, Mo., protesting against the passage of the Bryson bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5041. By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey: Petition of approximately 1,180 signers, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 and other prohibition legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5042. Also, resolution adopted by Temple Beth Israel, of Maywood, N. J., entreating the President of the United States and the Congress to use their good offices in compelling Great Britain to perform its written obligations to the Jewish people by carrying out the terms and conditions of the Balfour Declaration and of its mandate over Palestine and to further compel Great Britain to take action forthwith to vitiate its Palestine white paper completely; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5043. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Albert E. Taylor and 4,419 other residents of the First Congressional District of West Virginia and vicinity, opposing House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 23, 1944

(Legislative day of Monday, February 7, 1944)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou seeking Shepherd of our souls, in days of darkness and doubt Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort us. Give us to understand that in the narrow fold of Thy will we are more free than in the wide plains of our own unhallowed desires; that in following Thee we find an adventure that our aimless wanderings can never know. We thank Thee that nothing in life or death, in this world or any other world, can separate us from Thy love which passeth understanding.

Hear our prayer for those in a world cursed by war, in these fearful times living hourly in the presence of danger and death. Be Thou the comfort of the bereaved, the home of the homeless, the guardian of the widow and the fatherless. Sustain those who suffer from wounds and sickness. Be Thou the Shining Presence in every fear-shadowed area of life. Take to Thyself those who are swept away by the hurricane of battle. Hasten the glad day when righteousness and justice shall be triumphant and peace shall bless our land and

every land and the prophetic vision shall be fulfilled: "Violence shall no more be heard in thy land, wasting nor destruction within thy borders; but thou shalt call thy walls salvation and thy gates praise." We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, February 22, 1944, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on February 21, 1944, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 158) for the relief of Colonel Anderson F. Pitts.

### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT— APPROVAL OF BILLS

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On February 21, 1944:

S. 1324. An act for the relief of the Wisconsin Electric Power Co.;

S. 1391. An act for the relief of W. R. Jordan and Mabel Jordan;

S. 1417. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to donate and convey on behalf of the United States, to Jack Henry Post, No. 1, of the American Legion, Anchorage, Alaska, the wood-frame building, known as the Telephone and Telegraph Building, located on lots 7 and 8 in block 17, Anchorage, townsite; and

S. 1494. An act for the relief of the William J. Burns International Detective Agency.

On February 22, 1944:

S. 255. An act for the relief of Josephine M. Melchior;

S. 817. An act for the relief of George A. Rogers;

S. 921. An act for the relief of Mrs. Neola Cecile Tucker;

S. 933. An act for the relief of Lee S. Bradshaw;

S. 1077. An act for the relief of William A. Haag;

S. 1164. An act for the relief of Lucille Sleet;

S. 1288. An act for the relief of Luther Thomas Edens;

S. 1325. An act for the relief of Joseph Moret; and

S. 1528. An act for the relief of Col. Anderson F. Pitts.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Burton	Eastland
Andrews	Bushfield	Ferguson
Austin	Butler	George
Bailey	Byrd	Gerry
Bankhead	Capper	Gillette
Barkley	Caraway	Green
Bilbo	Chavez	Guffey
Bone	Clark, Idaho	Hatch
Brewster	Clark, Mo.	Hayden
Bridges	Connally	Hill
Buck	Davis	Holman

Jackson	Nye	Tydings
Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel	Vandenberg
La Follette	Overton	Wallgren
Lucas	Radcliffe	Walsh, Mass.
McClellan	Revercomb	Walsh, N. J.
McFarland	Reynolds	Weeks
McKellar	Russell	Wheeler
Maybank	Shipstead	Wherry
Mead	Smith	White
Millikin	Taft	Wiley
Moore	Thomas, Idaho	Willis
Murdock	Thomas, Utah	Wilson
Murray	Tunnell	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] are absent because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are absent on public business.

The Senators from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN and Mr. SCRUGHAM] are absent on official business.

Mr. WHITE. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HAWKES], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent because of a death in his family.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

### CONTROL OF PRICES AND INFLATION: FAIR WAGE AND LABOR POLICY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I received from Mr. Arthur E. Gerch, secretary of the Wisconsin Retail Food Dealers Association, of Milwaukee, Wis., a copy of a resolution which I should like to have printed in the RECORD. It relates to a suggestion which they think should be put into effect in relation to attempting to control the O. P. A.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be appropriately referred and printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

### RESOLUTION REITERATES NEED FOR INFLATION CONTROL ACT

Whereas the Price Control Act will expire on June 30, 1944, and whereas the Little Steel formula and the President's hold-the-line order have been upset by recent wage and other concessions to various groups, the effect of which has been to bring closer and uncontrollable inflation; and

Whereas the Wisconsin Retail Food Dealers Association, representing a large number of the independent retail grocers of the State of Wisconsin, favors and is prepared to lend its support to the establishment of a sound